

out a system of graduated or progressive rates similar to that applying to individual income. There is much that can be done to help small business in this tax field and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the subject their prompt and earnest attention.

If we neglect the health of small business in this Nation we are betraying our duty of preserving the economic integrity of the Nation; let us then assume our rightful obligation to grant reasonable assistance to small business by the prompt enactment of suitable legislation.

CONGRESS SHOULD NOT BE ADJOURNED WHILE
VITAL PROBLEMS REMAIN UNSOLVED

Mr. Speaker, at this point I desire to express my opposition to any early sine die adjournment of the House of Representatives while vitally important legislation remains pending.

Just a few of the problems that still challenge our legislative conscience are the enactment of a civil rights program, school construction aid, adequate hous-

ing and slum clearance, and flood disaster insurance. These problems, as well as many others, very deeply affect the general welfare and progress of the country. It is my judgment that we are morally bound to remain in session until these vitally important problems are legislatively solved for the good of all Americans.

In Memoriam: To a Great Man, and a Great Patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALFRED D. SIEMINSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 1956

Mr. SIEMINSKI. Mr. Speaker, June 30, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski,

world-renowned composer and pianist, who became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts.

At home and abroad, on both sides of the Iron Curtain, Paderewski left a sublime understanding of freedom with a humility that strove to walk in the footsteps of God.

The anniversary today of the passing of this great man, of this great patriot, more fully serves to remind me that freedom is indeed worth living for and, if need be, worth dying for. May God ever bless and keep green the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski. He lives in the hearts of all who love freedom and its thrilling song.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1956

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou in whom there is no darkness at all, the light which on this bright June morning scatters the shadows that have hid the flowers and darkened the streets is Thy messenger to us. Be Thou the light of our minds as the sun is the light of the day. Take away every evil thought that leaves its shadows there. Drive out the darkness of anger, selfishness, covetousness, and impurity. Make us centers of Thy radiance that we may reflect Thy spirit in all the gloom of this day that tries men's souls.

O Light that followest all the way,
We yield our flickering torch to Thee;
Our heart restores its borrowed ray,
That in Thy sunshine's blaze its day
may brighter, fairer be.

We ask it in the name of that One who is the light of the world. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 28, 1956, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Tribbe, one of his secretaries.

INCREASED RETIREMENT PAY OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE FORMER LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication from the President of the United States, which, with the accom-

panying paper, was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Senate of the United States:

In compliance with the request contained in the resolution of the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring therein), I return herewith S. 3581 entitled "An act to increase the retired pay of certain members of the former Lighthouse Service."

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 29, 1956.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concurred therein.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determina-

tion of the claims, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations and the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, under the rule there is a regular morning hour today. I ask unanimous consent that statements made in connection with the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, and take up nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Raymond J. Kelly, of Michigan, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska, vice George W. Folta, deceased;

Richard E. Robinson, of Nebraska, to be United States district judge for the district of Nebraska, vice James A. Donohoe, deceased; and

James F. Brophy, of Georgia, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Georgia.

By Mr. HENNINGS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

R. Jasper Smith, of Missouri, to be United States district judge for the western district of Missouri, vice Charles E. Whitaker, elevated.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frederick H. Hamley, of Washington, to be a United States circuit judge, ninth circuit.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Public Health Service be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations will be considered en bloc; and, without objection, they are confirmed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the nominations today confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY ACT OF 1954

A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Washington, D. C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 (with an accompanying paper); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

REVISION OF LAWS RELATING TO ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION OF CERTAIN CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Presidential Advisor on Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed in foreign areas and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to overseas assignments (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF MINNESOTA BRANCH, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the State convention of the Minnesota Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, met in Minnesota on June 8 and 9. I ask unanimous consent that two resolutions adopted by this convention be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas many employees accumulate large amounts of sick leave during their years of service and are not now given credit for it in any way whatsoever: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota branch of the National Association of Postal Supervisors, in convention assembled in St. Paul, Minn., June 8 and 9, 1956, go on record as approving H. R. 8830, which gives an employee who is retiring credit for all unused sick leave upon retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Minnesota delegation in Congress and to THOMAS MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office Committee.

Approved by the State convention, Minnesota branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors.

D. O. BODIEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CAMBRIDGE, MINN.

Whereas the postage rates have not appreciably increased over a long period of years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Minnesota State Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, in convention assembled held in St. Paul, Minn., June 8 and 9, 1956, go on record endorsing the provisions of H. R. 9228 and urging the speedy adoption of the postage rate increase bill; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the entire Minnesota congressional delegation and also to Representative THOMAS MURRAY, chairman of the Post Office Committee, and also to the Postmaster General.

Approved by Minnesota State Convention of the Minnesota Branch, National Association of Postal Supervisors, St. Paul, Minn., June 9, 1956.

D. O. BODIEN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

CAMBRIDGE, MINN.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. J. Res. 182. Joint resolution to extend the time for filing the final report of the Commission on Government Security to June 30, 1957, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2385).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. Res. 291. Resolution opposing Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1956 (Rept. No. 2388).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 3482. A bill to provide for transfer of title of certain lands to the Carlsbad Irrigation District, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 2389).

By Mr. CHAVEZ, from the Committee on Public Works, without amendment:

S. 4116. A bill to increase the membership of the Senate Office Building Commission (Rept. No. 2387).

REVISION AND PRINTING OF COMPILATION OF LAWS RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF CERTAIN CARRIERS

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, reported favorably an original bill (S. 4145) providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act, and submitted a report (No. 2386) thereon, which was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unan-

imous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THYE:

S. 4140. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims resulting from the crash of a United States Navy plane at Minneapolis, Minn., on June 9, 1956; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 4141. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IVES:

S. 4142. A bill for the relief of Nicolaos Theocharous Grammatikos; and

S. 4143. A bill to provide for an additional payment of \$165,000 to the village of Highland Falls, N. Y., toward the cost of the water filtration plant constructed by such village; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOFFORD:

S. 4144. A bill to authorize the city of Rock Hill, S. C., to acquire certain tribal lands on the Catawba Indian Reservation, S. C.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 4145. A bill providing for the revision and printing of a compilation of Federal laws relating to the regulation of carriers subject to the Interstate Commerce Act; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to above bill, when reported by Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

By Mr. GORE (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. JACKSON, and Mr. PASTORE):

S. 4146. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 4147. A bill to deny social-security benefits to employees of the Communist Party and its affiliated organizations; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 4148. A bill for the relief of Way Tong Jung, Kin Koo Jung, Chor Yen Jung, Koo Ming Jung, and Poy Kee Jung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (by request):

S. 4149. A bill to implement a treaty and agreement with the Republic of Panama, by amending the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. J. Res. 187. Joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUTLER when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION OF GREETINGS TO CITY OF ORANGE, N. J.

Mr. CASE of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 301), which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Whereas the city of Orange in the county of Essex is observing this year the 150th anniversary of the granting of a charter by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; and

Whereas the city of Orange has played an important role in the growth and development of Essex County, the State of New Jersey, and the Nation; and

Whereas the city of Orange has given to the Nation and the State of New Jersey many leading citizens and was an early center of

industry and the arts in the 19th century; and

Whereas by action of the mayor and board of commissioners of such city there has been appointed a citizens' sesquicentennial committee to prepare for appropriate observance of the historic occasion when the city of Orange was partitioned from the city of Newark, November 27, 1806: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate hereby extends its greetings and felicitations to the city of Orange, Essex County, N. J., on the celebration of its sesquicentennial, and expresses its appreciation for the splendid services rendered to the Nation by the citizens of the city of Orange during the past 150 years.

NICOLAOS PAPATHANASIOU

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou.

This young man, a citizen of Greece, was employed as a cadet officer in the Hellenic merchant marine until 1950 when he joined a United States merchant ship. The United States Coast Guard subsequently issued merchant marine documents to him that were validated for emergency service also. In September 1950 Mr. Papathanasiou voluntarily arranged to be drafted and was inducted into the United States Army in October of 1951. He served overseas in Germany in the transportation branch of the Army in 1952 and was separated from the service September 10, 1953.

Among his documents is a letter of commendation from his commanding officer, Lt. Col. Samuel E. Sax, praising him for his conscientious attitude and efficient performance.

Here is a young man who says his one desire since he attended the American College of Athens in Athens, Greece, was to become a citizen of the United States. He says: "My spirit, heart, and soul are dedicated to the ideals of the American Nation and way of life."

Since Mr. Papathanasiou has been in this country he has conducted himself with dignity and honor and has in every way shown his appreciation of our democratic processes.

The bill provides that Mr. Papathanasiou be granted permanent residence and that the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

When I was in Portland, Oreg., a few days ago I had a conference with Father Angelo Gavalas, of the Greek Orthodox Church. I had the conference at his request. Father Gavalas explained to me that this man was an exemplary member of his parish and that, if he is allowed to remain in this country and become an American citizen, he plans to prepare himself for the priesthood.

I have gone into this case very carefully because I do not believe a Senator has the moral right to introduce a bill in the Senate which will have the effect of holding a man in this country, if such Senator is not satisfied the man is a fit subject to remain in the country.

Here we have a young Greek who has served our country in the armed services after having been inducted voluntarily,

and who has come out of the military service with the commendation of his commanding officer. It would be a great mistake to deport this young man, without first giving careful consideration to all the merits of his case. I deeply regret this case has been called to my attention so late in the session, because I believe the appropriate committee of the Senate should have adequate time in which to accomplish a study of the case.

However, I sincerely hope that if the committee finds in the closing days of the session it cannot take final action in the case, our Immigration Service will recognize the surrounding circumstances which have caused me to introduce the bill and will hold up deportation proceedings at least until the next session of Congress, and until another bill can be introduced and a thorough study of the case can be made.

I am satisfied that here is a young man who in the interest of justice and equity is deserving of being allowed to remain in this country.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4141) for the relief of Nicolaos Papathanasiou, introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY SHIP REPAIR ACT OF 1954

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, Public Law 608, of the 83d Congress.

I should like to say a few words about the background of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, and the justification, or, indeed, better yet, the urgent necessity for promptly extending that act until at least July 1, 1958.

During the 2d session of the 83d Congress, when I had the honor to serve as chairman of the Water Transportation Subcommittee of the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, I introduced S. 3546, a bill which was designed to provide an immediate program for the modernization and improvement of certain key vessels in our laid-up national defense reserve fleet. By key vessels I mean only those determined to be necessary for the defense of this country in time of break-out emergency.

As drafted, the bill authorized the Secretary of Commerce, within 6 months after the date of enactment, to enter into contracts for the repair, modernization, and conversion of certain vessels in the national defense reserve fleet to provide, for the purpose of national defense, an adequate and ready reserve fleet. The amount of the contract authority in the bill as drafted was limited to \$45 million. The contracts were required to be placed with private shipbuilding and ship repair yards. The bill further provided that such contracts should be entered into in accordance with applicable provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

Senators will recall that at that time, in June 1954, our privately owned American shipbuilding and ship repair yards were in desperate straits. In July 1954 *Fortune* magazine ran a feature article entitled "Gloom in the Shipyards." Therein it said:

The United States shipbuilding industry is not in danger of disappearing overnight, but it is quite sick—sicker, in fact, than any other major United States industry, with the possible exception of soft coal.

Therefore, there is no doubt that one of the factors which contributed to the need for, and passage of, the emergency ship repair bill was the plight of our privately owned shipbuilding and ship repair yards.

However, Mr. President—and this I want to emphasize—the emergency ship repair bill was in no way a "make work" program. In the thousands of vessels which comprise our national defense reserve fleet, the Secretary of Commerce, after consultation with defense authorities, designated only 205 as "key vessels" which should, under this program, be put in "immediately ready" status so that in the event of national emergency we would not have to spend 3 to 6 months in repairing them before they could be put into active service.

While the original Emergency Ship Repair Act authorized the making of contracts by the Secretary of Commerce for the repair of vessels in amounts not to exceed \$25 million, in a wise spirit of caution we appropriated only \$18 million with, I believe, the understanding that we would appropriate the additional \$7 million after we had had substantial experience in doing \$18 million worth of repairs to however many of the 205 ships it took to use up the sum appropriated.

As the sponsor of this bill, I felt it my duty to keep in close touch with the Department of Commerce so that I could report, from time to time, to the Senate the progress being made. I am happy indeed to be able to announce that the authorities of the Maritime Administration feel that the program has been a successful and wise one within the limits of the \$18 million appropriated. However, of the 205 vessels originally designated, 67 remain unrepaired and the \$18 million has been exhausted. Therefore, I introduce a joint resolution in the nature of an amendment to the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954. This joint resolution would extend the time for entering into contracts for repair—expiring August 20, 1956. I believe this is all that is necessary by way of enabling legislation to permit us to conclude the original program.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the *RECORD* at this point.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the *RECORD*.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 187) to extend the operation of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954, introduced by Mr. BUTLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and

ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 4 of the Emergency Ship Repair Act of 1954 (Public Law 608, 83d Cong.) is amended by striking out the words "within 24 months after date of enactment of this act," and inserting in place thereof "before July 1, 1958."

OPPOSITION TO DISCRIMINATORY ACTION AGAINST CITIZENS BECAUSE OF RELIGION—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF RESOLUTION

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 27, 1956,

The names of Mr. BUSH, Mr. IVES, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. NEELY, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. NEUBERGER, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota, and Mr. CHAVEZ were added as cosponsors of the resolution (S. Res. 298) opposing discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations, submitted by Mr. LEHMAN (for himself and other Senators) on June 27, 1956.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON H. R. 3073 FOR THE RELIEF OF THE SIGFRIED OLSEN SHIPPING CO.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for Mr. KEFAUVER). Mr. President, on behalf of a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given of a public hearing that will be held on Monday, July 2, 1956, at 1 p. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on H. R. 3073, a bill for the relief of the Sigfried Olsen Shipping Co. At the indicated time and place those interested in the proposed legislation will be afforded an opportunity to be heard.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and myself, chairman.

PINGFONG NGO CHUNG AND PEARL WAH CHUNG

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1375) for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Pingfong Ngo Chung, Pearl Wah Chung, Dorothy May Ackermann, Dr. Mahmood Sajjadi, and Wan Ngo Lim shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees. Upon the granting of permanent residence to each alien as provided for in this act, if such alien was classifiable as a quota immigrant at the time of the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to reduce by one the quota for the quota area to which the alien is chargeable for the first year that such quota is available.

And to amend the title so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain aliens."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on January 16, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1375, to grant the status of permanent

residence in the United States to the two beneficiaries. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1375, with amendments to include the beneficiaries of three similar individual Senate bills.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1375.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

TOINI MARGARETA HEINO

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2842) for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Toini Margareta Heino may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent membership if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of such act: *Provided*, That this shall apply only to a ground for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on June 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 2842, to waive an excluding provision of existing law in behalf of the beneficiary. On the same date, the House of Representatives passed S. 2842, by substituting the language of a similar House bill, which made no substantive changes in the bill.

The amendment is acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to S. 2842.

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

AHMET HALDUN KOCA TASKIN

The *PRESIDENT pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 245) for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin, which were to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act: *Provided*, That nothing in this section of this act shall be construed to waive the provisions of section 315 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as they apply to the said Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provision of section 212 (a) (9) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman may be issued a visa and admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of that act.

SEC. 3. The exemptions provided for in this act shall apply only to grounds for exclusion of which the Department of State or the Department of Justice had knowledge prior to the enactment of this act.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun

Koca Taskin and Ursula Jadwiga Milarski Goodman."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 28, 1955, the Senate passed S. 245, to waive a ground of inadmissibility in behalf of the beneficiary. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 245 with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar Senate bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 245.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

TERESA LUCIA CILLI AND GUISEPPE CORRADO CILLI

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1814) for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Giuseppe Corrado Cilli, which were, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 2. For the purposes of sections 101 (a) (27) (A) and 205 of the Immigration and Nationality Act, the minor child, Manda Pauline Petricevic, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of Mr. and Mrs. Paul G. Schuldt, citizens of the United States.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli, Giuseppe Corrado Cilli, and Manda Pauline Petricevic."

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on March 19, 1956, the Senate passed S. 1814, to grant to two minor children to be adopted by a United States citizen the status of nonquota immigrants, which is the status normally enjoyed by the alien minor children of citizens of the United States. On June 19, 1956, the House of Representatives passed S. 1814, with amendments to include the beneficiary of one similar individual Senate bill.

The amendments are acceptable, and I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to S. 1814.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Mississippi.

The motion was agreed to.

DEATH OF FORMER SENATOR THOMAS R. UNDERWOOD, OF KENTUCKY

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, it is with extreme sadness that I announce to the Senate today the death of a former member of this body and a distinguished son of Kentucky, Tom Underwood. He passed away in his hometown of Lexington this morning.

In his passing, Kentucky has lost one of its finest citizens; his community has lost one who had contributed much to its good; his family has lost a devoted husband and father, and I have lost one of the finest friends I have ever had over a period of 40 years.

Tom Underwood was a classmate of mine at the University of Kentucky. We continued our friendship throughout our adult life. In 1947, he gave of his time

and his great talents to manage my campaign when I was a candidate for governor. I then had the privilege of working with him in that official capacity. Later I was privileged to serve with him in Washington in the House of Representatives. When he came to the Senate to fill the vacancy and complete the unexpired term following the passing of another distinguished classmate of ours, Virgil Chapman, I was privileged to serve with him in this body, in the years 1951 and 1952.

I shall miss him. There are few in Kentucky whose passing would occasion a greater loss to us than that of Thomas R. Underwood.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I associate myself with the tribute which my colleague and friend from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS] has paid to former Senator Tom Underwood. He was a very genuine person, and was one of my best friends during my service in both the House and Senate. He was always cooperative, always willing to bear more than his share of the load. I considered him a highly competent legislator. He was a true and genuine friend.

To his wife and family Mrs. Johnson and I send our deepest regrets.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority leader, because I know in what high esteem Tom Underwood held the majority leader, and, through service with both of them, I know just what the majority leader thought of Tom Underwood.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the senior Senator from Kentucky and the majority leader.

I had the privilege and pleasure of serving with our late colleague, Tom Underwood, in both the House and Senate. To me, he was a man of sterling character, fine ability, and great integrity.

On occasion I received copies of his newspaper, and read it with great interest. He was fair and dispassionate in his discussion of the stories which he was using in his newspaper. He compiled a fine and outstanding record while a Member of the House of Representatives and during his service as a Member of the United States Senate.

It was with a great deal of sorrow that I heard the news today of the passing of our old friend. In view of the exemplary life which he led, I know that he is going to a greater and just reward.

ADMISSION OF RED CHINA AND OTHER COUNTRIES TO THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter which I, as chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, sent to Secretary of State John Foster Dulles yesterday.

This letter asks the Secretary of State to disclose the identity of the United States officials who are issuing stories that the United States cannot exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly, and that the State Depart-

ment may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward Yugoslavia and other halfway allies of the Reds. Representative Judd, in testimony before the subcommittee, has told us how dangerous these leaks are.

I hope to have an early answer to this letter.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 28, 1956.

HON. JOHN FOSTER DULLES,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 31 of this year, Congressman WALTER H. JUDD testified at length about security matters before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee. Among other things, he testified to the fact that from time to time systematic leaks seem to emanate from Government departments, the effect of which is to induce a conditioning of public opinion that is favorable to the Communist cause. I quote from his testimony as follows:

"Another thing—the leaks that come to the press. Here is one recently. All of you have seen in the press for 6 months repeated stories, especially from certain columnists, that the United States is going to recognize Communist China, and, after the next election, the United Nations Assembly will meet and admit Communist China to the United Nations. I asked about it 2 or 3 times down at the State Department, if this is true. It has been denied completely by everybody at the top.

"Finally, one came out a few weeks ago in a Kiplinger Letter. It said that at one of these conferences it was tentatively agreed that this should be done. It would be denied officially, the letter said, but the fact is the United States is going to recognize Communist China and not veto its entrance into the United Nations.

"I called up keymen and said, 'Has there been a change?'

"They said, 'No; we saw it, too. There is not a word of truth in it.'

"Now, the newspapers didn't think that up. Somebody in the Department told them that. This is the thing that goes on again and again. Leaks go out from underlings that this is what our policy is going to be. Now, we are going to recognize Communist China.

"That is not the President's policy. That is not Mr. Dulles' policy. That is not the policy of the Far East Division. Yet, somewhere down in the State Department or in the Pentagon or the National Security Council or somewhere there are people who passed this out. You go to the press people and they won't reveal their sources. I don't blame them.

"But this is handed to them as inside dope to pass out to their readers. This is the way in which they shift the thinking of the people toward further appeasement of the Communists."

I write this letter to call your attention to what would seem to be still another instance of what Congressman Judd complains about, in the July 2 issue of Newsweek. There, on page 13, under the heading Washington Trends, item No. 1 reads:

"RED CHINA IN THE U. N."

"Privately, responsible United States officials have about reached this conclusion: The United States probably can't exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly, which is due to convene in November, after the United States elections.

"Admission of Peking cannot be blocked by veto since the matter will come up in the General Assembly, not the Security Council. This is because the issue is not one of admission but of determining which regime will represent China.

"They also believe the United States may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward neutrals and even such halfway allies of the Reds as Yugoslavia.

"Their reasoning: Developing of national communism, as distinct from satellite communism, will create opportunities which America can and must exploit in the years which lie ahead.

"Note: There will be vigorous dissenters in both parties. Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, GOP floor leader, may lead a movement to take the United States out of the U. N. if Red China is admitted."

As chairman of the Internal Security Subcommittee, I am acutely aware of the serious damage that such reports are doing, not only here at home, but among our friends abroad. I write this letter to ask you if you will undertake to determine who are "the responsible United States officials" who have informed Newsweek that "the United States probably can't exclude Red China from the United Nations beyond the next session of the General Assembly." I ask you also to determine who are the United States officials who "believe the United States may have to adopt a more flexible attitude toward neutrals and even such halfway allies of the Reds as Yugoslavia."

I write this with the realization that you feel as strong as I do that these stories are seriously undermining the foreign policy of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Internal Security Subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I noticed in the press that the distinguished chairman of the committee had addressed a letter to the Secretary of State. I hope when he receives a reply he will make his information available to the Senate. I have seen articles in magazines and newspapers with reference to the subject to which the Senator has referred. To the best of my knowledge, it certainly does not represent the policy at the highest level of the Government. If there are those in the lower echelons in the Government who are deliberately throwing up these trial balloons in an attempt to change American foreign policy, I think we should know who they are and let them have the responsibility for it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. Let me say first that I entirely agree with the distinguished Senator from California, and the information will be made available to the Senate if we receive it.

Now I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I join with the Senator from Mississippi in his search for the evidence he is asking for in his letter to the Secretary of State. If there is going on within this Government a "creeping up," shall I say, to the acceptance of the notion of letting Red China into the United Nations at this time, or to the recognition of Red China, we had better know about it in the Congress of the United States.

I reiterate what I have said before that I am one Member of the Senate who is not going to support any move to admit Red China to the United Nations or to give her diplomatic recognition until Red China demonstrates by her record that she can be relied upon to keep her obligations under existing international law.

On this question the Senator from California and I have stood shoulder to shoulder more than once, and I am sure he joins with me in the position I take this morning. There are several things Red China must do—not merely talk about—to prove that she can take her seat in the family of peaceful nations. One is to release every American soldier and every American civilian now held in Chinese prisons, contrary to existing international law. Another is to proceed to abide by the truce made in Korea, and to proceed to abide by one obligation after another, under international law, which she at this moment is violating.

On this issue let me say there is no room, in my judgment, for division of opinion in the Senate of the United States. We are entitled to get the information for which the Senator from Mississippi is asking.

Mr. President, I am disturbed by another thing. I say this on the basis of some news releases—

Mr. EASTLAND. At that point, let me ask the Senator from Oregon a question. Does the Senator not think it is deplorable that those who have been put in prison in Red China have been forgotten?

Mr. MORSE. They have not been forgotten here in the Senate.

Mr. EASTLAND. I know.

Mr. MORSE. Every once in a while we try, I say most respectfully, to put the pressure on to get some action in the matter, not only through the State Department, but through the United Nations.

Mr. EASTLAND. May I make another comment—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The 2 minutes allowed for statements in the morning hour have expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. I ask unanimous consent to have 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator may proceed.

Mr. MORSE. I am disturbed about a press report which is made on the Donovan book, indicating that at one time the President himself expressed some concern about an alleged inflexible attitude in regard to Red China and the United Nations. I do not attribute it to the President, but I am disturbed about a book which attributes that attitude to the President. I think we ought to know if that is the President's attitude. The book is published, and it would be a very simple matter for him either to confirm or to deny what is said in it, in regard to his alleged attitude.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me?

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have relinquished the floor. The Senator from New Jersey can take the floor

in his own right, and speak in his own time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to identify myself with what the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from California, and the Senator from Oregon have said this morning. I feel confident regarding the attitude of the State Department with respect to proposals to admit Red China to the United Nations.

Let me say that for some time I have been identified with the movement in opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations; and in that connection I have been associated with Members of both the Senate and the House of Representatives in taking steps to have a plank in opposition to the admission of Red China to the United Nations included this year in both the Republican and the Democratic platforms. I certainly hope that will be done.

Mr. President, I am aware of the undercurrent of talk regarding this matter; and I have been connected with the United Nations, and know what is occurring. All of us must stand together in opposing any movement to admit Red China to the United Nations.

BENEFITS FROM STUDY OF INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, on Monday, June 18, the Senate, in its wisdom, passed Senate Joint Resolution 110, which calls for a study of Indian education. I was unable to be present that day, because of the wedding of my oldest daughter, which of course required my presence in Arizona. Had I been here, I would have made a few remarks in explanation of this measure, which I introduced earlier this year. A letter from Dr. William Kelly, of the bureau of ethnic research of the University of Arizona, so well explains the need for this proposed legislation and so encompasses what I would have said on the subject, that I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA,
Tucson, June 18, 1956.

Hon. BARRY GOLDWATER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GOLDWATER: The following is in answer to your request for our analysis of some of the benefits that might be expected to result from a study of Indian education.

Such a study should, of course, be limited to those areas where practicable and possible changes can be made in existing policies and methods. What I have to say is therefore tentative and subject to revision in light of recommendations to be made by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Indian education: Your resolution asks for a study and investigation of the "educational problems of Indian children from non-English-speaking homes."

As was pointed out by the Arizona subcommittee on Indian education, problems in Indian education have now shifted, for the first time, from the task of placing Indians in school to the task of finding more economical and efficient methods in Indian education. Crucial problems revolve around

methods for dealing with children from non-English-speaking homes.

Great dependence is rightly placed upon the system of formal education as the most effective means for bringing the American Indian population into a satisfactory adjustment with the non-Indian way of life. This is one reason why more than ordinary excellence should be demanded of the Indian school system.

On the score of costs, there is an equally potent reason for continued refinement of Indian school methods. National figures are not available, but data compiled on the cost of educating Indian children in Arizona tell the story:

1. Enrollment of Arizona Indian children in Federal schools during 1954-55 totaled 15,068.

2. The cost of operating the schools, not including construction costs and some administrative costs, was about \$10,956,800. The per capita cost was approximately \$727.15.

3. The per capita cost of educating non-Indians in Arizona elementary schools, during the same year, was approximately \$271.

The principal reason for the difference in costs is the necessity for maintaining boarding schools for about two-thirds of the Arizona Indian children in Federal schools.

Under such circumstances, where nearly two-thirds of the cost of education is devoted to student maintenance and one-third to education itself, no argument for highest efficiency in the classroom seems necessary. This is doubly true when it is intended that the school system itself play a major part in correcting the situation that requires the maintenance of boarding schools.

Efficiency in the Indian classroom is not merely a matter of professional skills and perfected curricula. The performance of the child, his willingness and ability to learn, also relate very definitely to the total Indian situation and most particularly to the nature of the triangular relationship between the child, the teacher, and the parent. This is especially true where parents do not speak English or where, for any reason, they do not understand the methods, purposes, and goals of education for their children.

To gain the greatest benefit from the study suggested in your resolution it is recommended that the investigation be started with a review of the results of experience in various situations in Indian education, such as the Navaho 5-year program, and combine this with a survey of the results of educational studies, world wide, in situations where special methods have been used for introducing European or American civilization to nonliterate people by means of formal education.

On the basis of these studies, and with the help of education specialists in the Indian Service, a program of research to discover answers to some of the critical problems in American Indian education can be carried through. It should be pointed out in this connection, as mentioned above, that research of this kind must be turned very sharply to the areas of school operation where change is considered by the Bureau of Indian Affairs to be practical and possible.

Transfer of Indians to public schools: Your resolution also calls for a study of the "possibility of establishing a more orderly, equitable, and acceptable program for transferring Indian children to public schools."

The problem, together with present State and Federal policies, should be reviewed and reported. It is possible that a new and acceptable approach could thus be suggested, but no large sums of money should be expended for this purpose. The present situation is, in many respects, based upon historical, legal, and self-interest aspects which no amount of study and reporting could change.

In some instances, however, attitudes and opinions, especially of local school-district officials, are based upon incomplete information and inadequate reports. Where this is the case, data should be gathered and a system established for the maintenance of necessary information.

State and local officials, for instance, are often reluctant to assume responsibility for Indian education because they do not know what is involved or what to expect in the future. At the present time there is no adequate record, for instance, of the numbers of Indian children, by age and grade, in all schools (public, mission, and Federal). Much more serious, there are no reliable demographic studies of Indian populations so that accurate forecasts can be made of future Indian enrollment, particularly in the more expensive high-school grades.

Of equal importance in determining State and Federal responsibility for Indian education is the local economic condition of Indian families, the extent of their tax contribution, and the extent of taxable property within school districts on Indian reservations.

It is recommended that the study to be authorized by your resolution determine, first, the extent of the need for this kind of information and, second, a practical and feasible method for maintaining and processing the necessary records. The study probably should not, in this instance, gather the field data since this work could no doubt be done more efficiently and economically by Bureau of Indian Affairs personnel.

A revised system for maintaining and processing record cards on Indian school-children would serve the further purpose of providing the Bureau of Indian Affairs with invaluable data on the total Indian population, particularly with reference to shifting residence patterns, family size, family income, occupational interests, and similar matters.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs, given the Federal policy of terminating special services for Indians, and the nature of the problems it must now solve, is operating in an information vacuum. There are no reliable reports being prepared on even the simplest and most basic kinds of statistical data. Federal-State relations with respect to Indian education, as well as many other aspects of Indian administration, would be served by study and experiment leading to the establishment of such reports.

Indians in public schools: Over and above the financial responsibility for educating Indian children in public schools, is the matter of determining under what situations and circumstances the Indians themselves are to be benefitted through public school education, as opposed to Federal school education.

This is an area, so far as we have been able to determine, of almost total ignorance. It is assumed, on logical grounds, that Indian adjustment to white society will be hastened if Indian children come into close and daily contact with non-Indian children in the school environment. Circumstances and conditions vary from place to place and these should be studied, not only to test the basic assumption, but to discover the nature of those situations where Indian children are deriving the greatest benefits from public school education.

Scientific verification of more rapid Indian economic and social development as the result of public school influence could produce an understanding among local people of the possibilities for the creation of human resources in the Indian population which would outweigh financial and other arguments which have been advanced in opposition to the idea of public school education for Indian children.

It is true that the Bureau of Indian Affairs has made great strides over the country in transferring Indian children to public schools. This is only part of the task. The other, which will be needed for some years to come, is to demonstrate to Indian parents and to local taxpayers that the transfer was a wise and necessary action.

It is recommended, therefore, that the study of Indian education include a comparative study of Indian children in a sample of varying school attendance situations.

Study costs: It would be unwise, in my opinion, to undertake extensive and detailed studies that, under the terms of your resolution, must be completed within 2 years. The Congress, and the American people, especially the Indian people, are not entirely convinced that social science and educational studies can result in solid benefit for the Indians concerned. A relatively modest beginning under the authorization of your resolution could lay the foundation for more profitable and acceptable studies later on. It would be premature for us to attempt to determine the exact cost, but competent initial studies, covering the essential points as outlined above, could perhaps be made for no more than \$200,000.

I appreciate this opportunity to be of some assistance to you in this matter, and I sincerely hope that our comments will be helpful to you.

Yours very sincerely,

WILLIAM H. KELLY,

Director, Bureau of Ethnic Research.

UNUSUAL WAY IN WHICH HELLS CANYON PROJECT BILLS HAVE REACHED THE CALENDARS OF BOTH HOUSES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, indignation is growing in this country, and rightly so, against the unusual way the Hells Canyon project bills have reached the calendars of both Houses of Congress. These manipulations would put to shame the most skillful operator of the age-old shell game; and even Houdini himself, if he were alive, would have difficulty imagining that such could be done. To indicate this growing wave of feeling, I have selected editorials from 4 newspapers in 4 different States of the Union. I ask that they be printed at this point in the RECORD, in connection with my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Austin (Tex.) American of June 21, 1956]

FEDERAL POWER FORCES PUSH HALF BILLION DAM

Hungry for issues in this election year, Democrats on Capitol Hill appear ready to stage a big battle over a Federal dam at Hells Canyon, opposed by the Eisenhower administration. Their hope would be thus to dramatize their advocacy of public power and their dissatisfaction which the administration's preference for development of natural resources by private industry.

Hells Canyon, a deep and narrow gorge separating eastern Oregon from western Idaho, has been a subject of controversy for years. As Secretary of the Interior Douglas McKay, now running for United States Senator in Oregon against Senator WAYNE MORSE (Democrat), in May 1953 withdrew a long-standing opposition of that Department to the application of the Idaho Power Co. for permission to build three smaller dams in the canyon.

The Federal Power Commission on July 27, 1955, handed down a unanimous decision favoring the company's application for a 50-year license to build the 3 dams on a 100-mile stretch of the Snake River. These dams would flood the site of the proposed Federal Hells Canyon Dam.

The company already has begun work on 2 of the 3 dams. The FPC on June 15 announced that it had authorized the company to issue \$20 million in promissory notes to finance construction of one of the dams, but the National Hells Canyon Association and other public power groups are challenging the company's license in the United States Court of Appeals.

And Senator MORSE and 29 other Senators, including the 2 North Dakota Republicans, WILLIAM LANGER and MILTON R. YOUNG, are backing a bill to authorize Federal construction of a high dam at Hells Canyon. After the death of Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY (Democrat, Kentucky) the Democratic leadership of the Senate switched Senator RUSSELL B. LONG (Democrat, Louisiana), who had voted against the bill in the Interior Committee, over to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to fill the Barkley vacancy.

McKay in May 1955 outlined before the Senate committee the administration's opposition to the Federal dam. He did not specifically endorse the Idaho Power Co.'s project. But he declared:

"We are firmly convinced that where a non-Federal proposal can provide results which, in terms of comprehensive development, are reasonably comparable with those anticipated from a Federal project, the people of the region should be encouraged to utilize in every proper way the available capacities of public or private organizations for doing the job on a non-Federal basis under conditions fully protecting the public interest."

The Federal dam proposed by the Morse bill and a companion bill in the House would be built at a cost of \$500 million. By comparison, the private power company would spend only about \$250 million on its three dams and transmission lines. And it would pay close to \$10 million a year in taxes on the project.

Even so, Democrats are calling the granting of a license to Idaho Power Co. a "give-away." Senator RICHARD L. NEUBERGER (Democrat, Oregon), who will campaign for MORSE this year, called FPC support of the private project a major step in the destruction of the Army engineers' master plan for the full development of the power resources of the Columbia Basin.

[From the Oregon Journal of June 22, 1956]

WHERE EMOTION RULES

It now becomes pertinent to ask whether the 11th hour drive in Congress to push through authorization of a high Hells Canyon dam is designed primarily to benefit the region or reelect Democratic Congressmen in key States.

The word sent down from Democratic Chairman PAUL BUTLER to Democratic leaders in both houses would seem to indicate the latter reason is paramount.

Committee reshuffling following the death of Senator ALBEN BARKLEY (Democrat of Kentucky) has made it possible to jar loose from the Senate Interior Committee a Hells Canyon bill. Democrats on the House Interior Committee are confident of sending out a companion bill by having bought the vote of Representative J. EDGAR CHENOWETH (Republican of Colorado) in return for their support of the Frynigan-Arkansas project in his State. Whether Hells Canyon legislation can be forced through before the planned mid-July adjournment is a matter of speculation. Even if it can, it seems unlikely President Eisenhower will sign it in view of his past attitude.

What must be borne in mind is that even if a high Hells Canyon dam is authorized,

authorization doesn't mean construction. It could be years before any money is appropriated. This has been the experience with many other projects in the Columbia basin. And even after the go-ahead construction would require 6 to 8 years.

Meanwhile, Idaho Power Co. is proceeding with the building of Brownlee Dam, largest of the three for which it has approval from the Federal Power Commission. It has 1,000 men at work and already has built a tunnel 2,500 feet long and 38 feet in diameter, for the purpose of diverting Snake River waters at the low water period this summer.

If it is not stopped, it will be producing power from Brownlee in the summer of 1958. This dam is expected to yield 414,000 kilowatts, and any of these not needed by Idaho Power will be fed into the Northwest power pool. Immediately upon Brownlee's completion, Idaho Power will start construction on Oxbow and follow it with low Hells Canyon. The three will produce 783,400 kilowatts, nearly as much as high Hells Canyon.

Brownlee is consistently referred to as a low dam. It will be 395 feet high, one of the 15 highest in the world. For the kinds of flows produced by the main stem of the Snake, its effectiveness in lowering flood crests in the lower Columbia would not be greatly less than that of high Hells Canyon, even in such a high runoff year as this one. Army engineers' figures prove the real flood control problem lies elsewhere than the main stem of the Snake.

In our view, the difference in power and flood control which high Hells Canyon would offer is not great enough to justify perhaps a 10-year delay in time and more than triple cost.

Wouldn't it be wiser, as one of our readers has suggested, to put the money high Hells Canyon would cost into other Columbia Basin projects which will furnish more effective flood control, and let Idaho Power get on with a project that will provide substantial benefits to the region?

It is unfortunate that Hells Canyon has been regarded, on both sides, as a symbol of the private versus public power issue. The Journal, which believes in both public and private power, has never regarded it so. Here is a place where emotion has replaced reason, to the detriment, we believe, of our region.

[From the San Francisco News of June 20, 1956]

POLITICS IN HELLS CANYON

For years now, there has been a political tussle—fanatical at times—over who builds what dams in Hells Canyon, Idaho.

The New Dealers have wanted the taxpayers to put up a single dam, to cost some half-billion dollars.

President Eisenhower has another policy. He says the Government should help develop natural resources—but only where there is a national benefit and where private enterprise can't or won't do it.

So the Idaho Power Co., under license from the Government, is ready to go ahead with a series of three smaller dams, to cost half as much as the Government project would have cost.

And private enterprise, unlike Government-owned projects, pay taxes—which is a double relief to the taxpayers.

In any case, the Democratic leadership in Congress has worked up a political spectacular out of this situation. It is hauling out of committee bills to authorize construction of the Federal dam.

The idea is not so much to get the dam built, but to get votes for Democratic candidates—especially Senators MORSE, of Oregon, and MAGNUSON, of Washington. The Democrats figure President Eisenhower would veto the bill, as he doubtless would. But they estimate the veto would enhance their

claim that by letting private, taxpaying enterprise develop these resources, the administration is "giving away" public property.

How much "giveaway" there is in pouring taxpayer money into something private capital can do is a question they don't answer, of course.

Politics. It's wonderful.

[From the Idaho Daily Statesman, Boise, Idaho, of June 8, 1956]

MR. RAYBURN DEMANDS A TRADE

Congressman CHENOWETH, of Colorado, admitted Wednesday that he had agreed to change his previous stand against Hells Canyon and give it committee support to allow it to come to the House floor. The Colorado Representative said he had agreed with Speaker SAM RAYBURN that he would trade his vote for a promise to force out action on a Colorado dam, long bottled in committee.

We have no way of knowing what the Idaho delegation thinks of this political horse-trading but we wonder how Mr. RAYBURN, who not so long ago was rounding up support for the tidelands bill, which affected his home State of Texas much the same way Hells Canyon affects Idaho, fares with our elected representatives. We believe that at least three of the Members of the Idaho delegation supported the Texan in the tidelands matter. We also are sure that the Colorado delegation was equally as helpful in that States' rights contest. But to get out a Colorado dam, Mr. RAYBURN demands a trade. If this is not hypocrisy of the first water, it certainly is brazen politics.

As far as the Hells Canyon legislation is concerned, it doesn't matter whether it passes Congress or not. President Eisenhower will veto any Hells Canyon bill that comes to his desk and Congress does not have the power to override such a veto.

Mr. Eisenhower will veto the bill for the simple reason that his partnership plan, in this instance especially, is really at work, relieving the Federal Treasury of the expenditure of funds for power dams. Additionally, the Hells Canyon legislation is what the Democrats believe will be a helpful gesture to Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, a late comer in Democrat ranks. Mr. Eisenhower is especially interested in that race. The trade of Hells Canyon for one United States Senator shows the respect the Democrats have for either public opinion or the rights of a small State.

No matter what happens, Idahoans have learned that its delegation gains nothing by supporting other States in their fights for their resources. When the chips are down, as they are at this time, the Democrats prove to be of short memory and poor principle.

We hope either Senator WELKER or Senator DWORSHAK, or both of them, make this point clear when and if Hells Canyon reaches the Senate floor.

SENATOR GEORGE OF GEORGIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, during the debate yesterday and the day before on the mutual security bill, all of us were once again impressed by the valuable and notable service which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], is rendering to the people of America and to all people who yearn to be free and remain free.

The contribution which my colleague, the Senator from Georgia, has made and is making to the cause of peace and for the sake of all humanity will be remem-

bered and extolled when the history of these difficult times is recorded. His place in the history of the fight for peace is absolutely secure.

He is one of the giants who all too infrequently are called to serve in this distinguished body.

Mr. President, today in the New York Times there appears an editorial which pays a very fine tribute to Senator George and to the inspiring and moving speech he delivered last Wednesday in support of the pending mutual security bill. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PLEA BY SENATOR GEORGE

It is unlikely that the United States Senate will often hear a more dramatic or moving plea than that on behalf of the administration's foreign-aid program made by Senator WALTER F. GEORGE. Senator GEORGE is the senior Member in point of service. He is leaving the Senate at the end of this term and this may have been his last great policy speech. He is a member of the opposition party and chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. He has urged a reluctant Senate to make no further cuts in our assistance program and has asked Democrats and Republicans alike to support the President.

Senator GEORGE does not view this issue in the light of expediency or superficial economy. Obviously he does not view it in any sense that could be called partisan. He is seeking no personal advantage and no political acclaim. He has said that he has already had his reward for his services to the Nation in the feeling that he has tried to aid his country's cause and may have been able to do so. He gave a son to that cause.

This question of foreign aid, in his thinking, is a matter of morals. It involves the leadership of the United States in world affairs. It takes in broad areas of human hopes and aspirations, of frustrations, fears and dangers. It is not a problem for the adding machine, but for the conscience. In this connection he said to the Senate:

"I cannot think that divine providence has permitted us to become the responsible leaders of the world only to break that hope now. If the free peoples lose confidence in us we will have disappointed the last hope of mankind and we will have utterly failed to justify the sacrifices of our heroic dead, whose bodies rest now in the blue waters of nearly every ocean around the world."

This is the strongest ground upon which to make the case for our aid program. Senator GEORGE has suggested that it is a matter of keeping faith. We must keep faith with our allies and friends and with those helpless ones who need us. We must keep faith with ourselves and with our position of leadership. We must keep faith with our own traditions and with our own dead who died for those traditions.

It is possible to question the fashion in which some of our assistance is given and is used. It does not seem possible to question the moral ground upon which a plea such as that of Senator GEORGE is made nor possible to be deaf to it.

RECENT LONG-RANGE GROWTH IN ARIZONA

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, those of us who live in the youngest State in the Nation have every reason to be proud of that residence. To tabulate the phenomenal growth populationwise and

economicwise in Arizona, one of our leading banks has prepared, by one of its vice presidents, a monthly summation entitled "Arizona Progress." Because the June issue of this remarkable journal contains a very comprehensive record of recent and long-range growth in Arizona, I am anxious that my colleagues have an opportunity to observe these figures. The author, Mr. Leggett, is not only one of the Nation's outstanding economists and bankers, but he is also possessed of an ability to present economic figures in an interesting and sometimes entertaining way. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARIZONA PROGRESS

PRODIGAL SON'S LETTER TO HIS FATHER

DEAR FATHER: Ever since I can remember you have written me a long letter on Father's Day. These letters came to me when I was in school, in the service, and lately in business. They have been full of fatherly counsel on a variety of subjects ranging all the way from sex to economics. This year let's reverse the procedure. I think you should be told some of the facts of life.

In retrospect you must admit that most of the advice you have given me has been wrong. For example, you always harped on the importance of working hard and going to bed early. I soon discovered for myself that hard work is for peasants and retiring early is for the birds. On the few occasions when I did these things I missed out on a lot of fun and good contacts.

Another mistake was your admonition not to gamble or go into debt. Everything in life is a gamble, including marriage and Government bonds. Remember the fellow in the Scriptures who buried his talent, i. e., put it in a safe-deposit box, but wound up losing it (probably inflation). On the other hand, a neighbor who played the stock market with his talent got 2 for 1 (apparently a stockpile splitup).

As for debt, well now. A man is no longer judged by what he owns but by what he owes. One's standing in the community is measured by his borrowing power. As a result of taking wild chances on borrowed money I shall soon be able to retire in comfortable luxury whereas you and brother Joe, who followed your advice, will probably plod along until age 65 and then be forced to live on social security.

Meanwhile, however, my own boys are quite a problem. They are lazy, undependable, and don't appreciate the value of money. When I tell them they must study hard and go to bed early, they just give me the you-know-what. I hope that you and mother can do something with them when they vacation with you this summer.

Sheepishly yours,

BLACKIE.

ARIZONA AND NEIGHBORING STATES LEAD NATION'S POPULATION PARADE

In the 10-year period since World War II, Arizona holds undisputed rank as the Nation's fastest growing State. It has not only led the Nation in rate of population growth, but it also stands first in percentage growth of income, bank deposits, manufacturing output, mineral production, and value of farm crops.

At the same time Arizona is not an isolated oasis of growth in a desert of stagnation. It is literally surrounded by other areas of dynamic development. All four States bordering on Arizona were listed among the top 10 in population growth over the past decade.

Leading States in population growth

State	1945 population	1955 population	Percent gain
Arizona.....	594,000	980,000	65.0
Nevada.....	149,000	225,000	51.0
New Mexico.....	537,000	795,000	48.0
Florida.....	2,465,000	3,452,000	40.0
California.....	9,344,000	13,032,000	39.5
Delaware.....	286,000	387,000	35.3
Michigan.....	5,475,000	7,236,000	32.2
Utah.....	591,000	781,000	32.1
Maryland.....	2,096,000	2,669,000	27.3
Connecticut.....	1,769,000	2,241,000	26.7

Source: U. S. Census Bureau Population Estimates by States.

As to the future, projections of the United States Census Bureau indicate that Arizona's population will double during the next 20 years, reaching a figure of about 2 million by 1975. For some mysterious statistical reason, it is ranked second to Nevada in rate of projected growth but, considering the fast company in which we are traveling, even the most enthusiastic Arizona booster will probably settle for any position "in the money." If the census bureau statisticians are right, the southwest corner of the United States will continue to be the hottest growth area in the country.

Leading States in projected growth

State	Estimated population, 1955	Projected population, 1975	20-year percent gain
Nevada.....	225,000	461,000	104.9
Arizona.....	980,000	1,977,000	101.7
California.....	13,032,000	25,896,000	98.7
Florida.....	3,452,000	6,429,000	86.2
Oregon.....	1,669,000	2,871,000	72.0
Washington.....	2,570,000	4,138,000	61.0
New Mexico.....	795,000	1,206,000	51.7
Delaware.....	387,000	574,000	48.3
Maryland.....	2,096,000	3,956,000	48.2
Utah.....	781,000	1,163,000	47.6

Source: U. S. Census Bureau and U. S. News.

ARIZONA RANKS FIRST NATIONALLY IN RATE OF INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

Manufacturing jobs in Arizona hit a new all-time peak of 35,000 last month. This compares with a figure of 15,000 5 years ago and 11,000 10 years ago. In the postwar period, Arizona has far outstripped all other States in percentage growth of industrial employment. Manufacturing output, now running at an annual rate of nearly \$400 million, has doubled since 1951 and is 4 times the 1946 volume.

The following table lists the leading States in percentage growth of manufacturing activity over the past 10 years. It will be noted, incidentally, that all of the States bordering Arizona are included in the top 10, namely: New Mexico, Nevada, California, and Utah. In short, the great Southwest is going great guns industrially as well as in other respects.

Manufacturing employment by States

State	December 1945	December 1955	Percent gain
Arizona.....	11,200	32,700	192.0
New Mexico.....	7,100	17,600	147.9
Nevada.....	2,700	5,900	118.5
California.....	636,000	1,113,700	75.1
Florida.....	86,600	144,900	67.3
Utah.....	20,900	33,900	62.2
Kansas.....	77,000	123,600	60.5
Idaho.....	16,100	25,400	57.8
Michigan.....	758,700	1,178,200	55.3
Oklahoma.....	61,400	91,600	49.2

Source: U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

CONSTRUCTION VOLUME IN ARIZONA AT NEW ALL-TIME HIGH IN 1955

Although we accumulate a lot of statistics that we have no particular call for, by the same token we sometimes lack figures which would be very useful. An example of the

latter is the amount of building that is done in Arizona. No statistics are available either on the volume of construction or on the value thereto.

However, in view of the importance of this industry, we have worked out a method for approximating the dollar value of construction in the State. Based on a study of building permits, wage payments to construction workers and reports by contractors to the State Tax Commission, some rough calculations can be made. The following table is a result of these studies.

*Construction expenditures in Arizona
(As estimated by Valley National Bank)*

[Dollar volume]

1946	\$75,000,000
1947	100,000,000
1948	125,000,000
1949	100,000,000
1950	125,000,000
1951	160,000,000
1952	200,000,000
1953	250,000,000
1954	270,000,000
1955	300,000,000

The above estimates include all types of construction, public and private, including highways and municipal facilities. According to our calculations, the dollar amount of building in Arizona last year totaled about \$300 million, a new all-time record. This is about triple the annual volume from 1946 through 1949 and is probably equal in dollar value to all the building in Arizona during the decade of the 1930's exclusive of public works.

So far this year some decline in local building activity has been taking place. Residential volume has definitely slowed in the Phoenix area although it is still good in many other parts of the State. Commercial construction, particularly for new manufacturing facilities and shopping centers, continues high. The same is true of new schools, churches, etc.

ARIZONA, TOP PRODUCER OF NONFERROUS MINERALS, ALSO LEADS IN GROWTH RATE

Arizona, of course, leads all other States in the domestic production of copper, ac-

counting for about 45 percent of the national total. It also stands first in the combined production of the so-called nonferrous metals which include lead, zinc, gold, and silver. Utah ranks second in this field but has dropped far below Arizona in the dollar amount of output. Arizona not only leads in volume but also has had by far the best percentage gain since World War II.

Leading producers of nonferrous metals

State	1945	1955	Percent gain
Arizona	\$95,963,006	\$351,631,254	266.4
Nevada	24,186,294	62,436,160	158.1
Montana	35,465,505	88,061,823	148.7
Utah	90,018,641	217,173,000	141.3
Washington	7,140,242	16,360,324	129.1
New Mexico	26,386,781	52,883,000	100.4
Colorado	16,676,521	22,304,000	33.7
Idaho	37,709,975	48,897,254	29.4
California	11,152,681	13,882,100	24.5
Missouri	36,456,309	40,528,800	11.2

Source: U. S. Bureau of Mines Reports, 1955 figures preliminary.

10-year growth of Arizona retail business by counties

County	1945 sales	Percent of State	1950 sales	Percent of State	1955 sales	Percent of State	Percent gain 1945 to 1955
Apache	\$2,957,059	0.7	\$5,546,550	0.7	\$7,799,025	0.6	163.7
Cochise	20,796,431	5.3	29,780,441	3.8	48,281,309	4.0	132.2
Cocconino	11,982,959	3.1	26,541,508	3.4	34,481,437	2.9	187.8
Gila	11,633,773	3.0	20,263,877	2.6	26,999,848	2.2	132.1
Graham	6,205,004	1.6	12,887,992	1.7	14,020,472	1.2	126.0
Greenlee	4,646,885	1.2	10,597,703	1.4	11,344,163	.9	144.1
Maricopa	185,914,532	47.8	389,759,540	50.2	631,093,494	52.1	239.5
Mohave	6,354,283	1.6	9,348,019	1.2	9,318,967	.8	46.7
Navajo	10,467,535	2.7	17,395,970	2.2	22,479,417	1.9	114.8
Pima	72,246,132	18.6	149,942,163	19.3	246,143,554	20.3	240.7
Pinal	14,549,843	3.7	34,804,673	4.5	52,726,594	4.4	262.4
Santa Cruz	7,216,629	1.9	11,440,077	1.5	15,899,776	1.3	120.3
Yavapai	14,709,861	3.8	24,521,352	3.2	29,440,263	2.4	100.1
Yuma	19,290,050	5.0	33,746,530	4.3	60,719,495	5.0	214.8
State total	388,970,976	100.0	776,576,395	100.0	1,210,747,814	100.0	211.3

Arizona statistics

	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955
Annual totals:					
Retail sales	\$905,392,750	\$1,000,103,901	\$1,051,887,109	\$1,048,366,581	\$1,210,747,814
Income of individuals	1,225,000,000	1,387,000,000	1,428,000,000	1,468,000,000	(1)
Agricultural marketings	359,969,000	384,844,000	419,972,000	370,485,000	337,270,000
Manufacturing output	214,000,000	202,000,000	312,000,000	300,000,000	350,000,000
Mineral production	235,289,000	220,686,000	242,572,000	239,974,000	351,631,254
Tourist business	120,000,000	135,000,000	150,000,000	160,000,000	175,000,000
Bank deposits (December 31)	536,096,163	617,261,001	641,833,880	695,052,812	757,782,163
Bank loans (December 31)	225,226,728	274,967,294	254,096,097	208,204,693	371,953,373
Federal tax payments (fiscal year)	106,356,762	142,525,946	165,840,697	163,109,922	167,714,000
State and local taxes (fiscal year)	96,652,039	102,525,226	111,313,179	121,298,525	129,114,065
Population data:					
State total	796,000	870,000	930,000	993,000	1,040,000
Maricopa County	360,000	385,000	420,000	460,000	490,000
Phoenix, city limits	109,000	119,000	130,000	140,000	167,273
Greater Phoenix	250,000	265,000	290,000	315,000	335,000
Pima County	155,000	175,000	190,000	205,000	215,000
Tucson, city limits	46,000	48,000	50,000	54,000	91,800
Greater Tucson	140,000	160,000	170,000	185,000	195,000
	April 1952	April 1953	April 1954	April 1955	April 1956
Nonagriculture employment:					
Contract construction	14,900	18,100	18,600	18,900	17,900
Manufacturing	26,800	29,400	26,200	30,500	34,800
Mining	12,800	12,700	13,700	13,700	14,900
Service industries and miscellaneous	30,900	33,000	33,800	35,800	39,000
Transportation and utilities	19,600	21,000	19,600	20,300	19,800
Wholesale and retail trade	48,200	51,800	52,100	54,000	55,700
Government, Federal	14,000	13,200	13,600	14,600	15,700
Government, State and local	23,300	26,300	26,700	28,600	32,500
Total (BLS and ESC estimates)	190,500	205,500	204,300	216,400	230,300
Monthly comparisons:					
Retail sales	\$80,525,118	\$92,838,784	\$87,737,012	\$98,579,731	\$110,691,932
Printing and publishing	1,861,354	2,137,935	2,243,625	2,653,009	2,905,631
Rental income	3,294,067	3,537,153	3,632,142	4,340,014	5,229,219
Restaurant sales	7,743,630	8,583,743	8,027,948	8,747,391	10,285,751
Utility revenues	6,217,354	6,003,746	9,010,476	9,695,026	10,695,192
Gasoline consumption (in gallons)	25,819,823	27,606,480	27,317,153	30,445,540	32,152,502
Valley Bank business index	143.0	164.2	151.2	158.9	164.9

¹ Not available.

Phoenix statistics

	May 1952	May 1953	May 1954	May 1955	May 1956
Monthly comparisons:					
Bank debits (in dollars)	286,158,000	276,446,000	323,470,000	371,726,000	429,865,941
Building permits (in dollars)	775,107	1,134,475	1,391,865	602,755	2,390,545
Postal receipts (in dollars)	235,258	249,702	268,176	318,581	358,752
Telephones in service (number)	74,832	85,036	95,647	108,112	119,240
Electric connections (number)	76,199	82,069	90,058	96,542	104,737
Gas connections (number)	66,300	72,347	80,293	87,916	94,406

Tucson statistics

	May 1952	May 1953	May 1954	May 1955	May 1956
Monthly comparisons:					
Bank debits (in dollars)	95,083,000	104,865,000	106,683,000	132,503,000	162,133,944
Building permits (in dollars)	420,559	684,583	400,230	965,138	2,292,668
Postal receipts (in dollars)	118,325	129,484	132,480	146,688	184,170
Telephones in service (number)	46,428	49,914	55,012	59,034	64,774
Electric connections (number)	44,545	48,429	50,473	53,916	57,741
Gas connections (number)	34,643	38,498	41,531	45,671	49,689

DISCRIMINATION INVOLVING RELIGIOUS BELIEFS AND UNION MEMBERSHIP

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I was very happy to note that a resolution has been submitted by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] in opposition to discriminatory action against United States citizens because of religious faith or affiliations.

The purpose of this worthy resolution, Senate Resolution 298, is to protect American citizens while abroad from being discriminated against because of religious affiliation. I am in full accord with this purpose.

However, Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a matter of discrimination within this Nation against members of a religious group. I hope that discrimination will gain the same concern of my colleagues who sponsored this resolution, especially those who are members of or who are allied with the Americans for Democratic Action, an organization which constantly is proclaiming its belief in the rights of individuals.

I, too, have spoken out on the subject of the rights of individuals, only to find that the ADA line of protection of individual rights does not extend to labor-union members. Just as this resolution opposes discriminatory action against those outside our country, the ADA line opposes discriminatory action against individual rights for those outside the unions.

Two examples of the failure of the ADA and its supporters to uphold the rights of individuals have been reported in the press recently. Both involve religious beliefs and union membership, and in neither case did the ADA protest.

First, I refer to an article which appeared in the May 29 issue of the Washington Post and Times Herald. This United Press dispatch tells of the Supreme Court ruling which allows railroad workers to be discharged under union-shop contracts, even though their religious beliefs forbid them from belonging to unions. These workers are members of the Plymouth Brethren religious sect. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECT MEMBERS LOSE IN UNION-SHOP TEST

The Supreme Court yesterday left standing a lower court decision that railroad workers whose religious beliefs forbid them to join labor unions may be fired under union-shop contracts.

The challenge to the Railway Labor Act's union-shop provisions was brought by two Los Angeles members of the Plymouth Brethren religious sect.

When they refused to join unions, they were fired from their railroad jobs under the union-shop agreements prevalent in the industry. They sought Federal court intervention, but the lower courts upheld the firings.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the second article is an Associated Press dispatch which appeared in the June 12 issue of the New York Times. It deals with a similar case in Staten Island, where another member of the Plymouth Brethren faced the predicament of violating his religious beliefs or losing his job. Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RAILROAD MAN LOSES JOB APPEAL IN COURT

WASHINGTON, June 11.—The Supreme Court today denied a hearing to Theodore F. Otten, who was dismissed from his railroad job on Staten Island because his religious beliefs prevented him from joining a union.

Mr. Otten contended his constitutional rights were violated by the 1951 amendment to the Railway Labor Act, which permitted union-shop agreements in that industry. Under those agreements a worker must become a union member 60 days after he is hired.

The Supreme Court on May 21 decided that the amendment superseded State right-to-work laws as applied to the railroad industry.

Mr. Otten, a member of the Plymouth Brethren, refused to join the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. He was dismissed as a railroad maintenance worker on the Staten Island Rapid Transit Co., a subsidiary of the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I also request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a third article; it is from the April 19, 1956, issue of the Washington Star. This Associated Press dispatch tells of the efforts of another

religious group, the German Baptist Brethren, to meet this dilemma.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECT'S BAN ON UNIONS POSES PROBLEM ON JOBS

Members of a religious sect forbidden to join labor unions headed back home today with little guidance from Government officials on how they can otherwise get industry jobs.

A half dozen bearded, black-garbed members of the sect, the old German Baptist Brethren, conferred yesterday with Secretary of Labor Mitchell and Theophil C. Kammholz, General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board.

Both officials said the group's problem was more with the unions than with the Government.

The church members arranged to return here in a couple of weeks for a conference with AFL-CIO president, George Meany.

They gave the officials a statement saying that while they had no objections to labor unions for other people and recognized they had accomplished much for the working classes, their faith prevented them from belonging to unions.

They said they believe strictly in nonresistance, and unions are often involved in conflict including "violence, coercion, compulsion, picketing, and other means of force."

They said they hope to work out a mutual understanding wherein they could work in union-organized plants and, instead of belonging and paying dues to a union, could regularly donate an equal sum to some public charity.

"We do not desire to profit individually above that accorded to union members for the same labor," they said. "We know the unions would not profit from this arrangement, but they could receive a blessing by recognizing this divine principle of the New Testament."

Lester Fisher, of Covington, Ohio, spokesman for the group, said the 250-year-old sect's youth was being crowded off the farms into industry. Some, he said, had found jobs only to lose them when they refused to join unions.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I am not familiar with either of these religious groups, but I know that it is a serious matter when a man must choose between supporting himself and his family and violating his religious principles and beliefs, especially when that choice comes in the United States of America.

I can only ask where the ADA defenders of individual rights were when these actions took place.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I am happy to join the many other freedom-loving peoples the world over in commemorating June 30 as the anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Paderewski enriched the lives of millions while he lived, as a superb pianist and composer; indeed, his works live after him. But he was more than a great creative artist. He was also a great patriot and a symbol of the aspirations for freedom of the Polish people. As such he merits our special homage today.

We can draw rich inspiration from Paderewski's life, because he demonstrated that an artist can contribute not only in the eternal field of art but in the day-to-day affairs of men. He not only identified himself in his works and words with the cause of Polish freedom and independence, like Chopin before him, but he also undertook the statesman's role as first Premier of the Polish Republic following World War I. Subsequently, his feeling for Polish independence was so profound that he declined to give public musical concerts during World War II when Polish independence had again been snuffed out.

We Americans have an additional tie with Paderewski and the cause of Polish independence through that great American President and spokesman for the principle of self-determination, Woodrow Wilson, who cherished a special concern for Polish independence and a special regard for Ignace Paderewski, who played a heroic role in helping reestablish the Republic of Poland in 1919.

In these difficult days we must all pray and work together to achieve the day when Poland may again occupy its rightful place among the great free nations of the world and when the people of Poland will again be free.

Let no one in the world ever doubt for one instant the continued, burning opposition of the Polish people toward their Soviet tyrants; the demonstration in Poznan yesterday is positive proof of their strong feelings against injustice, degradation, and treatment as slave laborers.

In the meantime, the United States should liberalize its immigration and refugee laws to provide a refuge and a chance for a new life for those who may escape the oppression of the Soviet masters in Poland and in all countries behind the Iron Curtain.

As is true of all truly great men in the history of civilization, Paderewski belonged not only to his native country, Poland, but to mankind, to the universal cause of art, justice, and freedom.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, it is a strangely fateful coincidence that today as we pick up our newspapers and read reports that the people of Poland are rebelling against their Communist masters, we also note that today marks the 15th anniversary of the death of one

of Poland's great heroes—Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Had he lived, Jan Paderewski would have been in the van of every new effort to bring freedom to the people of his beloved Poland, as he fought so courageously to do for so many years prior to his death.

The gallant Poles look to the memory of Jan Paderewski as one of the shining beacons on the hard road back to freedom.

Paderewski, as a composer, was world famous. But music came second to his patriotism. At the first premier of the Polish Republic after World War I, he instilled in his people the love of freedom. He died in New York on June 29, 1941, as president of the Polish Parliament in exile.

We salute Jan Paderewski today—and we value the people of Poland in their never-ending efforts to be free.

PAYMENT FOR CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS ON PUBLIC LANDS IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to call up my motion to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1622 were concurred in. The matter has been cleared with the majority and minority leaders.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from South Dakota, entered on June 22, last, to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the House of Representatives to Senate bill 1622, a bill entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes," were agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1622) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota, of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, lines 4 and 5, strike out "of the Rapid Valley unit, South Dakota"; on page 2, line 5, strike out "\$18,383 as reimbursable" and insert "\$16,382 as reimbursement"; on page 2, line 7, after "thereof," insert "on other lands"; and on page 2, line 10, strike out "13" and insert "30."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I move that the Senate concur in House amendments Nos. 1, 3, and 4, disagree to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS conferees on the part of the Senate.

AMERICAN POWER POLICIES MUST NOT LAG BEHIND THOSE OF THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the power policies of this administration are against the national welfare, when we consider the fact that the administration has yet to propose one new major Federal start in the watershed of the Columbia River system, where lurks over 40 percent of our country's hydroelectric potential.

By contrast, the June 26, 1956, issue of the New York Times declares that the Soviet Union has begun an all-out crash program to add to its power capacity. Today the United States produces 623 billion kilowatt-hours of energy, and the Soviet Union 170.2 billion. But Russia has a 1960 goal of 320 billion kilowatt-hours, and a 1970 goal of 600 billion. This is dramatically symbolized by the fact that Russia has under construction power plants which will be the largest on earth, when completed.

Can we afford to surrender for piecemeal use such vast sites as Hells Canyon, when Russia is tapping to the utmost the sites on its own mighty rivers? Harry Schwartz, Russian editor and expert of the New York Times, has pointed out that "the Kremlin's leaders expect that industry in the Soviet Union will have outproduced the United States by 1970."

We hope that this event never occurs. But hopes are not enough. Policies and programs are needed, too. Is the administration playing ducks and drakes with our national security when it abandons for full development our finest water-power sites, at a time when Russia is utilizing to the maximum the sites on such rivers as the Volga, the Ob, and the Yenisei? Energy, after all, may decide the industrial race of the future. Hydroelectric power is the most dependable of all energy sources, because it continues as long as water flows off the mountains, and rain and snow descend from the sky. It does not rely upon fuels which can be depleted like coal, oil, natural gas and uranium. The administration must reverse its present stand against full use and development of the vast power potential of the Columbia River Basin.

WASHINGTON LOWDOWN, BY LARSTON D. FARRAR

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, on June 13, I made some comments on the floor of the Senate in regard to a book entitled "Washington Lowdown," written by Larston D. Farrar. I have been advised by the publishers of the book, the Signet Book Co., that since June 15, not a single copy of the book can be bought on Washington newsstands.

Mr. President, I am opposed to all forms of censorship, overt and covert. There is strong evidence which seems to indicate a prima facie case that censorship is being extended to this book. It is not a book which is particularly complimentary to the present administration; indeed, it contains a great many critical statements in regard to the administration, in regard to members of the

executive branch of the Government, and in regard to some executive agencies.

Mr. President, I believe we are confronted again with that very basic principle of freedom which Voltaire expressed in more eloquent words, that though we may disagree with what a man says, we should defend to the death his right to say it.

So far as I know, there is no question that the book is free from libelous statements. If it be true that a covert censorship is being practiced against the book by distributors of books in Washington and in other areas of the country, I believe the public should take notice of that kind of dangerous censorship. I feel the book should stand or fall on its own merits, and that the reading public should be able to go to a newsstand and buy the book if it wants to read it.

I have been advised by the publisher this morning that they could sell a great many thousand copies of the book in Washington, D. C., if they could get it on a single newsstand in the city. They said, "If you have any question, Senator, as to what the situation is, go to any newsstand and try to buy the book, and you will be told by the vendors that they cannot obtain a copy of it."

I understand that a similar situation exists in Chicago and in some of the other great population centers. If the representations which have been made to me are true, I believe the American people should express their resentment against this type of covert censorship aimed at the Farrar book.

LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENTS FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, would the majority leader be willing to call up Calendar No. 2311, House bill 9952, at this time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business, H. R. 11356, the mutual security bill, be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 2311, H. R. 9952.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "duty", to insert "after the enactment of this section and"; on page 2, line 6, after the word "year", to strike out "For the purposes of this subsection, a part of a year that is 6 months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded," and insert "For the purposes of computing the amount of readjustment payment (1) a part of a year that is 6

months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than 6 months is disregarded, and (2) any prior period for which severance pay has been received under any other provision of law shall be excluded. There shall be deducted from any lump-sum readjustment payment any mustering-out pay received under the provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 or the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952"; on page 3, line 1, after the word "Defense", to insert "or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy"; in line 5, after the word "duty", to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; at the beginning of line 10, to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; in line 14, after the word "duty", to strike out "would be" and insert "is"; and in line 21, after the word "may", to strike out "subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration" and insert "become entitled, on the basis of subsequent service, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, the bill would authorize a system of readjustment payments to members of the Reserve components when they are involuntarily released from active duty after having served at least 5 years of substantially continuous active duty.

The amount of the readjustment payment would be computed by multiplying one-half of 1 month's basic pay of the Reserve component is serving at the time of his release from active duty, times the number of years of the reservist's active service, but not more than 18 years. The maximum payment that could result from this computation would be 9 months' pay.

This is not a retroactive bill. It is estimated that the cost would be approximately \$11,800,000. It is our hope that enactment of the bill will further contribute to personnel stability in our Armed Forces by affording an element of security to reservists whose services are needed on extended active duty.

The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Armed Services. The reason for asking that the bill be passed at this time is to permit men who retire on July 1 to receive its benefits.

I hope the bill will be passed. I ask unanimous consent that a statement on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR SALTONSTALL
PROVIDING A LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS WHO ARE INVOLUNTARILY RELEASED FROM ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. President, this bill would authorize a system of readjustment payments to members of the Reserve components when they are involuntarily released from active duty after having served at least 5 years of substantially continuous active duty.

The amount of the readjustment payment would be computed by multiplying one-half of 1 month's basic pay of the grade in which the member of the Reserve component is

serving at the time of his release from active duty times the number of years of the Reservist's active service, but not more than 18 years. The maximum payment that could result from this computation is 9 months' pay.

So far as responsible defense planners can now foresee, the active duty strength of our Armed Forces will remain at approximately 2,850,000. The maintenance of this active duty strength requires the service on extended active duty of many members of the Reserve components, especially officers, because of the existing statutory ceilings on the number of Regular officers. There comes a time when some of these reservists must be involuntarily released to inactive duty so as to vitalize the active forces with younger personnel. When this happens, the reservist must readjust himself to civilian life, frequently at a time when employment opportunity is limited and the reservist has passed the age group most desired by private employers. The problems attending such readjustments serve to discourage capable reservists from continuing on active duty when their services are eagerly desired by the Armed Forces and produce very real hardships to many of the reservists concerned. The readjustment payments that this bill would authorize are intended to serve as a monetary cushion in assisting the involuntarily released reservist to relocate and to readjust himself to civilian pursuits.

There are many precedents for the payment of severance or readjustment pay, most of which are now applicable only to members of the Regular components. While section 235 of the Armed Forces Reserve Act authorizes active duty contracts of up to 5 years for reservists and provides a separation payment of 1 month's pay for each year of the contract that is not performed through no fault of the reservist concerned, this authority has not been found practical of utilization by all the military departments and it produces relatively small separation payments in those instances in which it is used. The severance payments authorized in the case of Regular officers who fail of promotion or who are physically disqualified without meeting all of the requirements of the Career Compensation Act for disability retirement pay generally are computed on the basis of 2 months of pay for each year of active duty performed, with a maximum payment of 2 years' pay. Obviously, the payments authorized for Regular officers are in excess of those that would be authorized by this bill for reservists. The rationale for such a distinction is that the reservists who would be affected by this bill may continue to participate in Reserve activities while on inactive duty to qualify for Reserve retirement pay when they reach the age of 60. Presumably, officers who are separated from a Regular component for failure to be promoted or for physical disability would not ordinarily be eligible for reappointment in the Reserve or to qualify for Reserve retirement pay. The separation of Regular officers generally is completed and final and the severance pay is in the nature of an ultimate settlement. Furthermore, the computation of readjustment pay in this bill was formulated in the knowledge that its amount should not be so attractive as to encourage reservists to seek involuntary release, so as to qualify for the readjustment pay, or to discourage them from competing for appointments in the Regular services.

The bill contains provisions that are intended to prevent inequitable receipt of readjustment pay by those who do not deserve it and to avoid duplicate payments for the same service. For example, persons released from active duty voluntarily or because of moral or professional dereliction would be ineligible, as would persons who are immediately eligible for retirement pay upon their release. A person who is eligible

for both readjustment pay and severance pay under other provisions of law would have to elect one or the other. A reservist who is eligible for disability compensation from the Veterans' Administration would be required to elect this compensation or readjustment pay, but not both. Election of readjustment pay would not deprive such a person of any disability compensation to which he might become entitled because of service subsequent to the readjustment payment. Any amounts of mustering-out pay previously received by the reservists eligible for readjustment pay under this bill would be deducted from the amount of readjustment payment, but the years of service on which the mustering-out payments were based could still be counted in computing the readjustment pay under this bill.

The number of years of active duty that may be counted in computing the readjustment pay is 18. This limit was established in conjunction with another provision, which requires approval of the Secretary of the service concerned before a reservist who is within 2 years of qualifying for retirement pay may be involuntarily released from active duty. Since eligibility for retirement pay normally begins after 20 years of active duty, this second provision affords a measure of protection to the reservist who has more than 18 years of active duty.

The committee noted the many requests to make the bill retroactive in effect to cover the reservists involuntarily released after the termination of hostilities in Korea but before enactment of this measure. The committee is not unsympathetic to these appeals but retroactivity presents vexing questions in connection with the selection of a retroactive cutoff date that is fair to all concerned. It also would add substantially to the cost of the bill. For these reasons, the committee has decided not to give retroactive effect to these readjustment payments.

Mr. President, it is our hope that enactment of this measure will make a further contribution to personnel stability in the Armed Forces by affording an element of security to reservists whose services are needed on extended active duty. If there are no questions, I urge approval of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I thank the majority leader for his usual courtesy and helpfulness.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, I should like to announce the legislative program for next week.

An order for a call of the calendar on Monday has already been entered. Following the calendar call on Monday, the Senate will consider Calendar No. 2401, H. R. 7089, the omnibus survivors' benefits bill. It is expected that this bill will be followed on Monday or Tuesday by the bill to increase the public-debt limit, H. R. 11740. Also on Monday or Tuesday, we hope the Senate will consider Calendar No. 2039, S. 3449, the airlines capital gains bill.

The following list of bills will also be considered next week, if not on Monday or Tuesday, on Thursday or Friday:

Calendar No. 1987, S. 3457, conveying certain lands to Pierce County, Wash.;

Calendar No. 2163, House Joint Resolution 501, authorizing participation in the NATO Parliamentary Conference;

Calendar No. 2256, H. R. 9842, authorizing the Postmaster General to impound certain obscene mail;

Calendar No. 2285, S. 3743, adding certain land to the Lassen Volcanic National Park;

Calendar No. 2292, H. R. 10230, increasing the revolving coinage fund for minor coins;

Calendar No. 2297, Senate Joint Resolution 165, relinquishing consular jurisdiction in Morocco;

Calendar No. 2299, H. R. 5256, providing for the redemption of unsold migratory bird hunting stamps;

Calendar No. 2304, S. 3665, permitting single final proof prior to survey by Alaskan homesteaders; and

Calendar No. 2313, S. 3903, amending the Agricultural Development and Assistance Act.

Mr. President, in addition to the list of bills which the majority leader previously placed in the RECORD, conference reports, of course, are privileged and may be called up at any time.

I should like to announce that the conferees on the Defense Department appropriation bill have agreed. The House is considering the conference report, and I expect it to come to the Senate momentarily, at which time I shall ask that it be considered.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to amend further the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I understand that a message from the House with respect to the conference report on the Department of Defense appropriation bill has been received.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Sen-

ate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEUBERGER in the chair). The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of June 29, 1956, p. 11444, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I think the House action in agreeing to the conference report is what should be considered by the Senate. I do not want to belabor the Senate by asking for discussion on the report. I move that the conference report be agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from New Mexico what the conferees agreed to with respect to the increased appropriation which was made by the Senate for the Air Force.

Mr. CHAVEZ. The conferees agreed on \$800 million for aircraft and related procurement. They agreed on \$100 million for research and development. They agreed on \$40 million for operation and maintenance. They agreed on \$20 million for personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These were all agreements upon amendments which were added by the Senate, in order to guarantee the continued development of United States airpower, were they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. That was the only justification for the Senate to insist on its amendments, and the House has agreed to the amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. These appropriations were above the Bureau of the Budget estimates, were they not?

Mr. CHAVEZ. They were. As a matter of fact, they were one-fourth less than the amounts actually asked for by General LeMay.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Once more, then, the Senate and House have agreed that the air arm of the defense of the United States should be our primary concern in building up the defensive institution.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is quite clearcut. I assure the Senator from Wyoming that what we had in mind was to take care of the national security, and nothing else.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I congratulate the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations upon the excellent work which he has done.

I remember very well that when I was chairman of that subcommittee in 1951 and 1952 the Senate was unanimous in a ye-a-and-may vote for the establishment and extension of airpower.

Mr. CHAVEZ. One significant thing is that 88 Senators voted for the bill. Five others—making a total of 93 out of 96—were announced as favoring the bill, and had they been present they would have voted for it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. During 1951 and 1952 the Senator from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON], who is now the majority leader, and who was then a member of the Committee on Armed Services, also was very outspoken and very effective in carrying out the policy of strengthening the airpower of the United States.

Mr. President, I hope the conference report will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I move that the report be agreed to.
The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table prepared by the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Defense Department appropriation bill, fiscal year 1957, bill summary

Item	Appropriation, 1956	Budget estimates, 1957	House allow- ance, 1957	Senate allow- ance, 1957	Conference allow- ance, 1957
TITLE I—OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE					
Salaries and expenses.....	\$13,019,000	\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000	\$14,500,000
Salaries and expenses, Office of Public Affairs.....	447,500	450,000	450,000	450,000	450,000
Total, title I—Office of Secretary of Defense.....	13,466,500	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000	14,950,000
TITLE II—INTERSERVICE ACTIVITIES					
Claims.....	11,930,000	12,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000	11,000,000
Contingencies.....	40,000,000	35,000,000	32,500,000	32,500,000	32,500,000
Emergency fund.....	35,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000	85,000,000
Reserve tools and facilities.....	100,000,000	(1)			
Retired pay.....	495,000,000	525,000,000	515,000,000	515,000,000	515,000,000
Salaries and expenses, Court of Military Appeals.....	361,400	375,000	375,000	375,000	375,000
Total, title II—Interservice activities.....	682,291,400	657,375,000	643,875,000	643,875,000	643,875,000
TITLE III—DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY					
Military personnel.....	3,679,065,000	3,585,000,000	3,566,704,000	3,566,704,000	3,566,704,000
Maintenance and operations.....	2,831,019,000	3,192,000,000	2,954,581,000	2,967,057,000	2,967,057,000
Military construction, Army Reserve Forces.....	31,611,000	40,000,000	40,000,000	60,000,000	55,000,000
Reserve personnel.....	141,589,000	223,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000	215,000,000
Army National Guard.....	308,239,000	306,000,000	306,000,000	321,492,000	320,162,000
Research and development.....	333,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000	410,000,000
National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice.....	400,000	425,000	297,000	534,000	357,000
Alaska Communication System.....	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000	5,000,000
Total, title III—Department of the Army.....	7,329,953,000	7,761,425,000	7,497,582,000	7,545,787,000	7,539,280,000
TITLE IV—DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY					
Military personnel, Navy.....	2,486,109,900	2,483,900,000	2,478,316,000	2,478,316,000	2,478,316,000
Reserve personnel, Navy.....	91,811,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000	95,000,000
Navy personnel, general expenses.....	83,000,000	83,980,000	83,980,000	83,980,000	83,980,000
Military personnel, Marine Corps.....	650,244,000	647,500,000	647,100,000	647,100,000	647,100,000
Reserve personnel, Marine Corps.....	20,000,000	26,800,000	26,800,000	26,800,000	26,800,000
Marine Corps procurement.....	230,190,000	179,000,000	164,000,000	164,000,000	164,000,000
Marine Corps troops and facilities.....	181,605,000	175,820,000	171,820,000	171,820,000	171,820,000
Aircraft and related procurement.....	905,602,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000	1,732,900,000
Aircraft and facilities.....	809,632,000	813,400,000	810,772,000	810,772,000	810,772,000
Shipbuilding and conversion.....	1,387,634,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000	1,479,700,000
Ships and facilities.....	779,685,000	769,040,000	766,040,000	766,040,000	766,040,000
Procurement of ordnance and ammunition.....	185,842,000	206,000,000	204,000,000	204,000,000	204,000,000
Ordnance and facilities.....	182,889,000	166,680,000	163,680,000	163,680,000	163,680,000
Ordnance for new construction (liquidation of contract authorization).....	28,000,000				
Medical care.....	62,494,556	61,340,000	61,323,000	61,323,000	61,323,000
Civil engineering.....	120,069,700	130,100,000	129,600,000	129,600,000	129,600,000
Military construction, Naval Reserve Forces.....	28,061,400	17,000,000	9,704,000	9,704,000	9,704,000
Research and development.....	431,933,000	493,000,000	492,000,000	492,000,000	492,000,000
Service-wide supply and finance.....	303,000,000	289,720,000	289,644,000	289,644,000	289,644,000
Service-wide operations.....	96,500,000	102,508,000	102,472,000	102,435,000	102,435,000
Naval petroleum reserves.....	2,851,000	1,212,000	683,000	1,183,000	683,000
Total, title IV—Department of the Navy, general.....	9,127,759,556	10,047,600,000	9,999,534,000	9,999,997,000	9,999,497,000
TITLE V—DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE					
Aircraft and related procurement.....	6,306,000,000	6,048,500,000	6,048,500,000	6,848,500,000	6,848,500,000
Procurement other than aircraft.....	349,862,600	1,177,000,000	1,100,000,000	1,177,000,000	1,140,000,000
Research and development.....	570,000,000	610,000,000	610,000,000	710,000,000	710,000,000
Operation and maintenance.....	3,597,496,570	3,786,000,000	3,684,185,000	3,780,185,000	3,724,185,000
Military personnel.....	3,680,650,000	3,727,000,000	3,718,440,000	3,745,440,000	3,718,440,000
Reserve personnel.....	43,563,000	59,300,000	59,300,000	59,300,000	59,300,000
Air National Guard.....	192,191,000	258,700,000	258,700,000	258,700,000	258,700,000
Total, title V—Department of the Air Force, general.....	14,739,763,170	15,666,500,000	15,479,125,000	16,579,125,000	16,459,125,000
Total appropriations, titles I, II, III, IV, V.....	31,893,233,626	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000

¹ Reappropriation.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF COMPLETION OF ACTION ON REGULAR APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, agreement by the Senate to the conference report just adopted concludes action on all the appropriation bills with the exception of the foreign-aid appropriation bill. All the regular bills reported by the Committee on Appropriations, under the leadership of the chairman, the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], and the ranking mi-

nority member, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], have now moved through the Senate and through Congress. I think the Committee on Appropriations has done outstanding work, and I commend them.

I am informed that a foreign-aid appropriation bill will follow very shortly after we conclude action on the foreign-aid authorization bill.

The distinguished senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] is the chairman of the Committee on Public Works,

the chairman of the Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations, and the chairman of various other subcommittees. No Member of the Senate has been more thorough, more efficient, and more capable in his work than the senior Senator from New Mexico.

I think the results he obtained in the conference on the Department of Defense appropriation bill are almost unprecedented. It is rare for the House to agree to the exact amendment which the Senate includes in a bill.

I know that the people of his own State and of the whole Nation are grateful.

As majority leader, I am very happy we have had the cooperation we have received from the diligent members of the Committee on Appropriations and from the distinguished minority leader in making it possible to clear all the departmental appropriation bills before the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Texas will yield to me for a moment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I desire to thank the members of the minority who are on the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee. They have cooperated to the fullest extent. We have not always agreed, but we have respected the right of disagreement, and I want to make my voice heard, at least at this time, in thanking the members on the minority

side of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, with the adoption of the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill for 1957, action has been completed by the Congress on all the regular appropriations bills for next year. I have a table which reflects the action of the House of Representatives and the action of the Senate on the budget estimates submitted to each body. The final amount approved for the regular appropriations bills is \$52,014,166,315. This amounts to a net increase of \$543,722,069 over the budget estimates of \$51,470,444,246 submitted to the Senate. The chief reasons for the increase in the amount appropriated over the budget estimates are the following: Civil Service retirement and disability fund, \$230 million; rivers and harbors and flood-control projects, \$38,226,000; Air Force

build-up recommended by Senate Appropriations Committee, \$900 million.

There are two appropriations bills pending, and the figures on these bills are not reflected in the totals I have mentioned. The budget estimates submitted so far for the supplemental appropriation bill total \$3,133,980,325 and the budget estimate submitted for the mutual security program totals \$4,859,975,000. It is expected that these two bills will come to the Senate from the House in the near future.

The table does not reflect permanent appropriations, estimated to total \$7,564,859,833, which require no further action from Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a table showing the details for each department.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Table of regular appropriations bills, 84th Cong., 2d sess., fiscal year 1957

Bill No. H. R.	Title of bill	House			Senate			Public law, amount as approved	Increase (+) or decrease (-), law compared to budget estimates Senate	Public Law No.
		Budget estimates to House	Amount as reported	Amount as passed	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as reported	Amount as passed			
11177	Agriculture.....	\$1,987,302,268	\$1,983,512,508	\$1,983,512,508	\$1,980,841,668	\$2,016,771,068	\$2,018,331,068	\$1,993,744,968	+\$3,903,300	554
10899	Commerce.....	1,522,673,000	1,382,003,000	1,382,003,000	1,522,673,000	1,445,566,000	1,446,316,000	1,416,732,000	-105,941,000	604
10986	Defense.....	34,147,850,000	33,635,066,000	33,635,066,000	34,147,850,000	34,983,734,000	34,783,734,000	34,656,727,000	+508,877,000	-----
10003	District of Columbia.....	(182,899,500)	(179,797,800)	(179,797,800)	(182,899,500)	(181,682,050)	(181,687,490)	(181,612,490)	+7,074,000	-----
9536	Federal payment.....	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,358,650	22,708,650	22,708,650	22,558,650	+150,000	-----
9739	General Government.....	15,014,475	14,849,275	14,849,275	15,014,475	14,969,975	14,969,975	14,969,975	-44,500	578
9739	Independent Offices.....	5,783,704,000	6,005,157,260	6,010,543,290	5,783,704,000	5,915,997,258	5,925,187,646	5,966,517,826	+182,813,826	623
8390	Interior.....	426,748,200	415,963,200	415,963,200	435,142,300	433,851,400	433,876,400	423,994,100	-11,208,200	573
9720	Labor-HEW.....	2,363,648,400	2,296,810,781	2,296,981,781	2,363,885,400	2,372,023,281	2,372,523,281	2,366,380,781	+6,142,500	-----
11473	Legislative.....	93,664,903	89,376,450	89,376,450	122,496,933	117,804,058	117,804,058	117,804,058	-4,660,875	624
11319	Public Works.....	818,501,000	787,453,000	790,758,000	818,501,000	871,886,000	872,186,000	856,727,000	+15,459,000	-----
10721	State-Justice-Judiciary.....	598,169,820	541,367,372	541,367,372	599,104,820	556,271,517	556,271,517	548,980,957	+7,290,560	603
9064	Treasury, Post Office.....	3,649,872,000	3,618,699,000	3,618,699,000	3,649,872,000	3,639,579,000	3,639,579,000	3,629,139,000	+10,440,000	467
	Total.....	51,429,506,716	50,792,616,556	50,801,478,586	51,470,444,246	52,392,162,207	52,203,487,595	52,014,166,315	+\$543,722,069	-----

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I call up my amendments designated as "6-27-56-E" and "6-27-56-F," which, because they deal with the same subject, I intend to offer consecutively.

First I shall address myself to amendment E—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment should first be stated by the clerk.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, beginning with line 10, on page 25, it is proposed to strike out down to, and including, line 3 on page 26, and in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 2. Statement of policy: (a) The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, by the continuous development of airpower and the construction of nuclear weapons, and by the use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination. The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as

long as such danger persists, (1) to expand its own airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so as to be prepared at all times to resist any attack by Communist power, and (2) to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the two amendments en bloc?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I did not make that request. I said I would offer them consecutively. Therefore, I am offering first the amendment identified as "E." I want the full time, if it should be necessary.

Now, in order to explain this amendment—and I allow myself 10 minutes for that purpose—I must refer to the statement of policy which the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations has adopted as an amendment to the House bill. I congratulate the committee and its chairman, whose record and character have never been exceeded upon the floor of the Senate in all its history. The statement of policy as reported by the committee was directed to making it clear to the world why the United States

is authorizing these appropriations for mutual security—appropriations for defense and appropriations for economic aid. I read section 2:

The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action, use of economic pressure, internal subversion, or other means, to attempt to bring under their domination peoples now free and independent, and continue to deny the rights of freedom and self-government to peoples and nations once free but now subject to such domination. The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as long as such danger persists, to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable compatible with its own stability, strength, and other obligations, and as may be needed and effectively used by such free nations and peoples to help them maintain their freedom.

This is an excellent statement of policy, but it does not go quite far enough, in my judgment. It is fortunate that I have the opportunity of offering my amendment to this section immediately after the Senate has adopted the conference report on the defense appropriation bill of 1957. That bill, by vote now of the whole Congress, has increased the appropriations available for the construction of aircraft and for aircraft pro-

curement and for research, in order that the United States may continue to have a dominant control of the air—not for the purposes of aggression, not to wage war, but to make it clear to all nations that we do have the airpower, which alone can prevent aggression and a third world war.

And so my amendment is a simple one. On page 25 of the bill, after line 14, following the statement of the committee amendment that:

The peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action—

At that point my amendment would add the words—

by the continuous development of airpower and the construction of nuclear weapons.

That is a known fact. No one can deny that Russia, under the Soviet leadership, has been endeavoring to outproduce all the other nations of the world in nuclear weapons, and the Russians so boast.

The amendment reported by the committee recites, on page 25:

The Congress therefore declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue, as long as such danger persists—

Which means as long as danger from communism persists—

to make available to free nations and peoples upon request assistance of such nature and in such amounts as the United States deems advisable and compatible with its own stability—

And so forth. My amendment inserts in the committee amendment, after the words "as such danger persists," the following statement of policy:

(1) to expand its own airpower through the construction, in accordance with appropriations heretofore or hereafter made by the Congress, of planes, guided missiles, and other advanced weapons, so as to be prepared at all times to resist any attack by Communist power.

These are the only changes my amendment makes in the statement of policy. The purpose of those changes is to announce to all concerned—to all the nations of the world, and particularly to Soviet Russia—that it is our purpose, in pursuit of peace, to construct an Air Force which will be so great that it can protect the world from subversion by military force by the Communist power. We dare not risk the danger that the Soviet power may undertake an unnoticed attack upon the United States, such as was undertaken by the Japanese on December 7, 1941.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there can be no doubt on the part of any Member of the Senate, particularly on the part of any member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whose members have so clearly announced the danger, that today we should by means of adopting this amendment to the committee amendment, make it clear that we intend to keep in effect the appropriations which have been voted this year by the Senate.

We are operating now under limited time, and I wonder whether we can

shorten the debate by having the Senator from Georgia state now whether he will accept this amendment. It seems to me there is no controversy regarding it. The peace of the world was preserved when the British Government had control of the seas, but seapower is not now the great and decisive military factor. Today the dominant military power lies with the nation which has the facilities to deliver nuclear weapons at strategic points. There is no doubt that at this moment Russia could send its bombers over the North Pole area to the industrial centers of America, and that could be done without notice. A totalitarian power does not waste time declaring war, Mr. President. As was indicated in World War II, a totalitarian power strikes without notice; and we cannot hope to believe that the time has come when the totalitarian power has changed its spots. If we are to protect the free world against Communist aggression, we must make certain that the United States is not going to abandon the building up of her airpower.

Mr. President, let me ask the Chair how much time I have used.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Chair is advised that the Senator from Wyoming has used 11 minutes, and has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the former Secretary of the Air Force, and a very distinguished Member of this body, who knows this problem. I yield to him such time as he may wish to use.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, who always has been an ardent advocate of airpower.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I ask the distinguished Senator from Wyoming to state briefly exactly the purpose of his amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are two amendments. The first amendment declares it to be the policy of the United States to continue to expand its airpower as long as Soviet Russia continues to do so. In other words, I want disarmament, but I want disarmament by agreement, and I do not want the United States of America to be in such a position that it may be subject to another sneak attack.

Mr. SYMINGTON. What will the second amendment do?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The second amendment, which I submitted the other day, would provide a new section, section 13, as follows:

SEC. 13. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, in the event any portion of the funds appropriated by the Congress in the Department of Defense Appropriation Act, 1957, for aircraft and related procurement is impounded by Executive order or otherwise and not expended, there shall be withheld from expenditure a corresponding percentage of the unexpended balances of funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations contained in this act.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Is the Senator from Wyoming acquainted with the statement made by General Eisenhower on September 25, 1952, in which by implication he criticized the impounding of funds by the previous administration?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am aware that such criticism was voiced.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Nevertheless last year the funds which the Senate appropriated to maintain the Marine Corps at its current strength at that time were impounded by this administration. Is not that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes. The opinion of the Congress was that the Marines should be kept in a position of greater strength than that which they occupied at the time when the Congress appropriated the funds. But the administration, notwithstanding the Presidential signature to the appropriation bill making the appropriation for the strengthening of the Marines, gave orders that the money should not be expended.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The purpose of the Senator's second amendment is, in effect, to say that improving the air forces, naval forces, and armies of other countries should not be done at the expense of the United States Air Force. Is that correct?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does not the Senator know that in the case of some countries to which military aid is going, we have shipped the planes, but they have not yet trained the pilots; so the planes, in quantities, are lying around idle?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator is in a much better position than I am to state the facts. I shall be glad to have him answer his own question in that respect.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I think I presented those facts yesterday to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming, with respect to one particular case.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is the Senator referring to the situation in Belgium?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am. It is a matter of published record.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Although Belgium has the planes, it does not have the personnel.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Has not trained the personnel.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. That is correct.

Let me say to the Senator at this point that a young gentleman from my State, Mr. Larry Johnson, of Casper, Wyo., who was an all-American high-school football player on the Casper, Wyo., high-school team, on which he played center, and who was one of my two appointees to the Air Force Academy, was sitting in the gallery a few minutes ago. He is going to the Air Force Academy. I want to be sure that when he and all the other students at the Air Force Academy are graduated, they will have the material with which to defend themselves and their country.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. As the Senator well knows, commanders of all the major commands of the Air Force have stated in testimony released by the Department of Defense, that they are short of planes, that they are short of personnel, and that they are short of bases. That situation has now been recognized by the Congress, which, under the Constitution, has the responsibility to raise and maintain our military establishment.

As I understand it, what the Senator has in mind is that, inasmuch as the Congress has decided on more money for the Air Force, he does not want to see more money given to foreign military establishments if it is to be denied to the United States Air Force through the impounding of funds.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. My conviction is that if the United States does not have adequate airpower, the whole world lacks airpower, and a sneak attack on the United States would mean the destruction of freedom. Therefore, I believe it is important that both of these amendments should be added to the bill.

Inquiry at the desk indicates that I have only 13 minutes remaining of the time allotted to me under the unanimous-consent agreement. After I answer the Senator's next question, or after he makes his next observation, I shall ask the opposition to express itself, if there is any opposition.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is an able constitutional lawyer with long experience in this field. What we are really getting into is the question of the right of the President and his aides to thwart the will of the Congress with respect to the size of the Military Establishment.

Is not that true?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Constitution of the United States gives to the Congress the right to make the appropriations. Congress passes the bills. The bills are sent to the President, and when they are signed by the President they become the law of the land. The President then, under his oath of office to execute the laws which are passed by the Congress, with his approval, has no right to impound funds thus appropriated.

Efforts have been made in the past to give the President the power to veto sections or items in appropriation bills. I would be glad to support such an amendment. But when there is no such power in the President, I want to make it explicitly clear that he cannot act in that way. That is totalitarianism. That is executive government.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Last night several Senators stated they were voting only with great reservations for military assistance to Yugoslavia, and they were doing so on the basis of trust in the President. Certainly if the Senate is willing to trust the President in connection with foreign aid, especially foreign military aid, the President should respect the opinion of the Congress as expressed only today.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time will be charged to the remaining time of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Chair advise me how much time I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I want the Senators to know what is being offered. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3½ minutes. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am told by Senators who are walking around the Chamber that it may be possible to work out an agreement on the amendment. I therefore ask unanimous consent that my time may be suspended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection—

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. What is the request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is trying to state it. Is there objection to the request that the time of the Senator from Wyoming be suspended?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am asking that the time which is now being occupied by Members of the Senate in seeking to come to a compromise upon the amendment may not be taken out of my time. I have only 3 minutes remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia as much time as he may desire to use in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the statement of policy in the bill contains everything that is contained in the proposed amendment, except that the Senator from Wyoming desires to add, as an additional policy statement, that, so long as the threat of communism continues, the United States will build up its airpower and nuclear power, and so forth, for its own security.

As a matter of fact, it would present to the world, on the one hand, an assurance of help, and, with the other hand, carry the deadly threat of nuclear weapons. It has no place in the bill. It ought not to be added to the bill. What our policy is, is a matter for the determina-

tion of other committees which have jurisdiction over matters of that kind. If the Senator wishes to press his amendment, I suggest, rather than to continue to debate it on the floor, that we have a yeas-and-nays vote on it. I would agree merely to take it to conference, but I would not agree to insist on it in conference, because it is so decidedly inharmonious with the whole purpose of the Mutual Security Act.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now read from page 25 of the bill, beginning at line 10:

SEC. 2. Statement of policy: (a) The Congress of the United States recognizes that the peace of the world and the security of the United States are endangered as long as international communism and the nations it controls continue by threat of military action.

I ask the Senator if that language in the bill does not recognize the fact that there is a Communist threat of military action.

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from Georgia deny that the Communist threat of military action includes the threat of the use of nuclear weapons?

Mr. GEORGE. I do not know about that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Has not the Senator heard reports to that effect?

Mr. GEORGE. The declaration of policy which appears in the pending bill has been contained in all mutual-security bills practically in this form since the beginning. Sometimes it has been rewritten, but all mutual-security acts have carried practically this same declaration.

What I am pointing out is that it does not make very much progress toward the peace of the world to be threatening the world with nuclear weapons. It is not a matter of public policy which the Committee on Foreign Relations should be inserting in the bill. It is a matter for the Committee on Armed Services and for other committees of the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that Congress continues to appropriate the money to build the atom bomb?

Mr. GEORGE. I presume so. That comes within the jurisdiction of other committees.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. We are talking now about the jurisdiction of the Senate.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is the Senate which passes the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course the Senator understands it. Why, then, should not the Senate, after having just agreed to the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill, containing the funds, declare now that we intend to continue to build up our own airpower.

Mr. GEORGE. I would get nowhere arguing with the Senator. I merely say that it is wholly inconsistent with the mutual-aid program, a program which we instituted for the purpose of restoring a war-devastated world, to write this sort of threat in the very body of the preamble, so to speak, as a statement of policy. The Senator has other amend-

ments which undertake to force the President to use certain money for the Air Force or to suffer the withdrawal of an equal amount of money provided by the bill to carry out this purpose. The Foreign Relations Committee has nothing to do with atomic energy, and has nothing to do with building nuclear weapons, and has nothing to do with airplanes as such, or with navies, as such. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment.

I could not agree to take the amendment to conference unless it were understood that the other amendments he has submitted are to be withdrawn. If that is to be understood, I will agree to take this amendment to conference, but I will very frankly say that I do not think it has any place in the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do I understand the Senator now to say that he will accept the amendment to the declaration of policy and take it to conference?

Mr. GEORGE. I will, provided the other amendments of the Senator are withdrawn.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There is only one other amendment which is related to this subject, although I have two other amendments.

Mr. GEORGE. I mean the one that is related to this subject.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am a realist. I see what the situation is. It is 20 minutes to 2 o'clock. Many Members of the Senate are at luncheon and many are attending committee meetings. I know there are several committee meetings in progress from which it is not possible to draw Members at this time. I shall, therefore, in order to get this declaration of policy before the conferees, agree, reluctantly and against my better judgment, not to offer the new section 13 which I had intended to propose, to erect a legal bar against the impounding of funds appropriated by Congress only today for the defense of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am willing to take the amendment to conference, with the statement I made for the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment, which is at the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Add the following new section:

"SEC. 515. Provisions of this act authorizing the appropriation of funds shall be construed to authorize the granting in any ap-

propriation act of authority to enter into contracts, within the amounts so authorized to be appropriated, creating obligations in advance of appropriations."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, on behalf of the committee, and subject, of course, to further advice by the department heads who have to deal with this problem, I shall be willing to take the amendment to conference.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it provide for money not appropriated for contracts?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It merely gives to the Appropriations Committee the authority to use the contract authority within the limits of this bill, if it sees fit to do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I have one more amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed, in section 8 (a) which amends section 401, to add the following new paragraph:

(4) In the next to the last sentence of section 401 (a), which imposes a cumulative ceiling on the use of funds without voucher, strike out "\$50 million" and insert "\$55 million."

(5) Add to section 401 the following new subsection:

"(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President not to exceed \$5 million, to remain available until expended, to enable the President in his discretion, through programs of information, relief, exchange of persons, education, resettlement, to make grants to private nonprofit organizations engaged in keeping alive the will for freedom, and by other material means to encourage the hopes and aspirations of peoples who have been enslaved by communism."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the committee, so far as I am able to speak for it, is willing to accept this amendment and take it to conference. I think it is a meritorious amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does it increase the appropriation?

Mr. DIRKSEN. It would increase the authorization of the unvouchered funds.

Mr. President, the amendment has the support of the Secretary of State expressed in a letter addressed to me.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all time yielded back?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yes, Mr. President.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield back our time on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment identified as "6-28-56-C."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LANGER. I call up my amendment identified as "6-28-56-C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill it is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 14. Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this act, such provisions shall not be construed to authorize the appropriation for the fiscal year 1957 of amounts aggregating in excess of \$3,270,075,000.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last evening 27 Senators voted for the Long amendment which provided for a reduction of approximately \$2 billion. I now offer my amendment reducing the amount by \$1 billion.

Because of my temporary disability, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a statement which I have prepared in connection with the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I have no objection to the reading by the clerk, because of the condition of the Senator's eyes, if it may be understood that it will be within the time limitation.

Mr. LANGER. That is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, as I understand, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has 30 minutes. If the clerk uses the 30 minutes and has not concluded within that time he will discontinue reading, or there will be extra time yielded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Is there objection to the unanimous consent request? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will read the statement of the Senator from North Dakota.

There being no objection, the legislative clerk read as follows:

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, once more, almost as inexorably as death and taxes, the mutual security bill is with us this year for Senate action. Once again, as it has been asked every year since 1948, this body is asked to approve enormous expenditures of the people's money for a program which—I do not care how many times it may be denied—has lost the confidence of the American people. The point has been reached, Mr. President, when even its most fanatical supporters can no longer suppress their misgivings as to the soundness and effectiveness of a foreign policy which is predicated upon a profligacy of the public funds, and little else. I think it is about time we appreciated that this is the people's money we are throwing away—I say "throwing away" advisedly—and that the people are getting fed up with the entire business. As I shall attempt to demonstrate somewhat later in this statement, the people have good reason to be fed up.

I have repeatedly voted against the mutual security bills, and I intend to do so again this time. When the basic legislation, the Mutual Security Act of 1954, came before us, I voted against it in the Foreign Relations Committee, and I filed

a report setting forth the reasons for my dissent. It is not my purpose here to review all the considerations which I detailed in support of my dissenting views. Suffice it to observe that, among other things, I protested against furnishing new M-47 tanks to Yugoslavia's Tito; to a nation which is not particularly devoted to the cause of democracy; to a nation which was—and still is—unreliable and which might someday even direct against us the power we furnished it.

Oh, I know, this was said to be a calculated risk. It is now beginning to be clear that this was a miscalculated risk; and many a people has wound up in chains for errors of this kind. Mr. President, it is about time we stopped conducting foreign relations on the basis of a haphazard arithmetic which hardly passes for statesmanship.

I protested, too, against the pouring out of billions for military equipment for people overseas; and against the tremendous sums spent to maintain American troops and bases abroad, while neglecting our own military bastions in the United States. I protested against the dissipation of our national resources—resources which were once thought inexhaustible, but which, alas, we realize now are by no means unlimited. Like a great many other people who were concerned lest we spend our way into the economic collapse which the Soviet Marxists confidently predict, I worried over the greivous debt load of the United States. I protested against this load which should have been substantially reduced by this time, during the 10 years of postwar prosperity we are now supposed to be enjoying at inflated prices. If that debt load could not be whittled down during these years of high-level income, what shall we anticipate in lean years? Repudiation?

I pointed out in my report 2 years ago that we must no longer be deceived about NATO; that it was time we recognized it was a flat failure, and that, despite a thousand assurances to the contrary from our military leaders, the forces at the disposal of that organization could never offer any real obstacle to a determined push by 175 divisions of Soviet troops backed, as they are today, with atomic weapons. No, Mr. President, there is only one real deterrent to Soviet aggression, and that is the armed might and the economic solvency of the United States; and the fear of Russian leaders that though they might bomb the cities of Europe or of this country into radioactive dust, they would in turn be reduced to rubble by our own airpower. Today, NATO's disintegration has become self-evident even to our Secretary of State, who has been proposing methods for reinvigorating it along other than military lines.

Against all this scattergun squandering of tax money, I protested; but above all, I protested against the fundamental principles on which the so-called mutual-security bill is founded. The entire program is based upon a misconception as to how we should proceed in order to safeguard the security of our Nation. Somehow, the policymakers of our country for the past 8 years have managed

to persuade the American people and their Representatives in Congress that the only way to insure the security of the United States is by putting vast sums of money and arms at the disposal of foreign governments, many of whom, when the chips are down, are found in our adversaries' camp on important international issues. It is a curious conception—this notion that our security can be increased directly in proportion to the amount of money we spend abroad. It seems to involve two primary assumptions, both fallacious: First, that by giving away large amounts of money we would make friends of countries in those areas which are in dire need. We are coming to appreciate, to our sorrow, the fallacy of this assumption; high authority recently admitted that we should not expect any more than that these countries remain neutral. We found we could not buy their friendship; now we hope our aid program will at least preserve their neutrality in the latest phase of this coexistence battle of which we have heard so much from Khrushchev and his cohorts.

We should not be surprised at these developments. As it usually happens, generosity to friends results in loss of both money and friends.

The second erroneous assumption in this approach to security is that by furnishing military aid to friendly countries we may thereby build a strong military bulwark of freedom, against overt and subversive aggression. This assumption is still reflected in the current mutual security bill, which provides more than 3 times as much military as economic aid, as though nothing had been learned at all in the past 5 years about the nature of the enemy we face, and how that threat should be met. The policy planners are drifting blithely along, ignoring that all the trends in Europe are away from, not toward, increased military security; ignoring that the German people are most reluctant to conscript the divisions we thought we would have for NATO; ignoring that the French have moved all their infantry to North Africa in a "first things first" reaction to national interest; ignoring that even the British are seriously thinking of abolishing conscription; yes, ignoring almost everything of any relevance to the problem before us except the same blind course of spending more and more money on military aid.

Mr. President, in the past 2 years I have seen nothing to make me believe I was wrong in opposing the Mutual Security Act of 1954, or to feel that I should now change my position. No effort whatsoever has been made by the executive branch to reexamine the sterile policy it is following, or to challenge the assumptions we have been asked to swallow. On the contrary, the administration this year has asked for a bigger authorization, for more extended control, with nothing to justify it except the same worn-out slogans that have been tossed at us year after year.

And the program has become almost a disease of the National Government. It has become a habit, from which no relief is promised. If there was the slightest basis for hoping that the pend-

ing request would mark the end of this drain on American wealth, then, even though the program itself be badly planned, there might be some excuse for accepting it. But there is no such hope. I know what will happen and what has happened on this floor. One of my colleagues after another will rise to declaim that this is the last time he will vote for the program—at least, until the subject has been thoroughly reexamined. He will protest against the bill as bad legislation. But he will vote for it. And why? Because we have been sold a bill of goods, an excuse for a policy where there is no real policy. We have been given no choice, except a wrong one.

If ever, Mr. President, there was a program that called for an "agonizing reappraisal," it is the euphemistic monstrosity called the Mutual Security Act. Yet only now, after 8 years of a cavalier largesse with the people's hard-earned money, are we beginning to perceive that there must be something very wrong with what we have suffered to continue away beyond reason. Only now are we convinced that a complete examination must be made of the program.

Last Monday the Senate Foreign Relations Committee approved a resolution which would provide for an objective and impartial investigation of the entire aid program. It is a pity such a resolution was not adopted by the Senate at least 5 years ago. Both our prestige and our people would have been the richer. The worst of it is that there is no proof, other than unverified assertion, that our security would not have been equally as advanced, or retarded, as it is today. In fact, there is disturbing evidence that we are in a weaker position internationally than we were 2 years ago.

I know that the people of my own State have long since had enough of this mutual aid—or, as it is more accurately called, "foreign aid." They have been unconvinced by the battery of arguments thrown at them that there is anything mutual about it. They know it is a one-way street. They know it for what it really is, aid to foreign people, to foreign governments, which is taken out of their pockets. This draining of their resources hits them in two ways, first by depriving them directly of things they could buy for themselves, and second, by contributing to the inflationary process which operates every time vast sums are expended in nonproductive goods. Yet, at the very time when farmers are being driven to the wall, when small-business men are going broke, when a rebellion is brewing throughout the country against the weight of a murderous taxload, the administration has the temerity to ask for more billions. Stupidity in foreign relations is compounded by callous indifference to the welfare of our own people.

Mr. President, I have always believed it to be right for Americans to give assistance to people abroad whenever they are struck by a catastrophe or are in grave distress. The world knows, or should know, how generous Americans are by nature. But the first obligation of the American Government is to its

own citizens. The first duty of the American family is to itself. We are not here to remake the lives or the society of other peoples. In our effort to do so we have alienated friends, kindled resentment, and aroused jealousy of our material possessions. Just what this has cost us in cold cash, just what it has cost each individual American, we shall see in a moment, when we consider the staggering sums that have been spent striving for a supposed worldwide security, a venture which has produced considerable suspicion as to our motives. We should have remembered that extravagance often breeds contempt, among nations as well as individuals. Altruism without ulterior motives is something that most backward areas of the world, with their colonial history, simply do not understand.

On June 16, Mr. President, the Secretary of State delivered an address at Iowa State College, in which he denied that the taxpayers' money has been spent on so foolish an effort as to seek either gratitude or subservience.

After blandly asserting that the foreign-aid program was successful, he said:

Our policies command wide respect abroad, because of their intrinsic merit. But the success of our foreign-aid program is to be tested, not by gratitude, not by subservience, but by whether it makes more vigorous the freedoms elsewhere that buttress the freedom of ourselves. By that test, our program works.

Mr. President, this is a most astonishing statement. Neither by Mr. Dulles' test, nor by any other objective standard, can the foreign-aid program be characterized as a success. In fact, by almost any measuring rod it is an abysmal failure, and at an appalling cost. To say that our policies—any of our policies—have been a howling success in the face of the new Soviet dynamics, is to float in a pharisaical dream world.

Far from capturing any initiative in the cold war—or in its new seductive model of competitive existence—we have been captured by a snare of our own making, victims of a delusion that this thing called foreign aid can be a universal substitute for sound diplomacy and realistic thinking.

I submit, Mr. President, that one of the cardinal objectives of a foreign policy should be to keep old friends, win over new ones, and impress upon other nations—whether they be neutral or allied governments—the conviction that it is to their greatest advantage to conform their own policies to the great objectives of world peace and the independence of all nations, which we pursue. It might be worth while to cast a quick glance at some of the critical areas of the world, just to see how successful American foreign-aid policy has been.

The Middle East is one area that permits of no complacency by anybody. We have all been deeply concerned over the path which Egypt's leaders have been following in the past months. Economic aid programed for Egypt during fiscal 1955 and 1956 was fixed at approximately 100 million dollars. Presumably, one of the prime goals of our policy should have

been to prevent Egypt from being drawn into the Soviet orbit. Has our policy been successful? Just read the daily newspapers. In one of the most strategically vital areas of the globe, where the fate of civilization has repeatedly been determined throughout history, our policy—or lack of policy—has been a rank, dismal and tragic failure. We have lost Nasser, despite the foreign aid program; and we lost him because our diplomacy in the Middle East during the past few years is a bewildering illustration of a floundering policy in Washington that has brought us into disrepute all over the world. Diplomacy—not dollar aid—would have salvaged that situation in Egypt, and the records of the Department of State will prove it. We lost Nasser because we refused to sell him arms he could pay for in pounds, and at a time when we knew the alternative before him was to purchase munitions from the Iron Curtain. The path to peace in the Middle East is not through foreign aid; but through a hard diplomacy that knocks recalcitrant heads together in a definitive arbitral settlement of the Arab-Israeli crisis; a diplomacy that sternly warns these lilliputian nations that we simply will not tolerate any more of their sabre-rattling, much less full-scale warfare. But let us keep on drifting, and we are apt to find ourselves confronted with another Mussolini in North Africa.

The crowning irony of this whole wretched episode is that it had to be left to the Soviet Union to arrest the drift toward war in the Middle East, not for any "peace-loving" considerations, but for reasons of its own national and international aspirations. Our government sat on its hands, apparently fearful to move in any direction, fearful to show positive determination, lest it offend either party, hoping that someone else would resolve the crisis, or that it would go away like a bad dream.

We really showed a "recaptured initiative" on that one, did we not? Soviet action alone permitted the limited, temporary success attained by the Hammer-skjold mission. And here we are, still sitting on our hands, though the crisis remains with us; though the Arab-Israeli sore is festering; though the plight of Palestine refugees worsens; and though the Nasser regime has made it clear it will, when ready, smash at Israel with all the Soviet equipment it commands. Does anyone think that because we refrained from "offending" Nasser, his glandular reactions toward us will be more sugary and affectionate? Greece offers additional proof that our foreign aid program is a poor substitute for an intelligent, forthright diplomacy. Despite the millions upon millions we have poured into that country, Greek-American relations have been steadily deteriorating. But the Russians come along when a segment of Greek agriculture is threatened; all they do is buy up a few orange and lemon crops, and immediately grateful praise is tendered to them as the saviours of the Greek farmer. The same nauseating picture is repeatedly encountered elsewhere.

About the best that can be said of our foreign-aid accomplishments in the Far

East is that, although we are still bumbling along, we have not yet been thrown out of that area. But can it honestly be said that our aid policy has promoted brotherly understanding and strengthened the cause of peace? On the contrary, our predominantly military programing, designed to support an unrealistic association of infirm nations, has fanned old irritations and provoked suspicions as to the intentions of the SEATO powers. SEATO is a formula, not a structure; it is mere verbiage, devoid of any substantial vitality apart from the armed power of the United States.

Military aid to Pakistan enrages its Indian neighbor, and vice versa. Economic assistance freely given without strings, and even when on a nonreimbursable basis, is taken for granted with little or no credit acknowledged to the United States; whereas the hard business propositions extended with a wave and a flourish by the Soviet Union are acclaimed by the people as an unselfish contribution, from a nation whose motives are always ulterior.

If there is one nation on the face of the earth that at least should not show consistent hostility to the United States, that nation is India. It was our powerful support that pressured the British into granting India complete political liberty. We have felt a certain responsibility for the continued independence of that country. We have given India almost half a billion dollars in aid. Surely, one would think, this should have been sufficient to deter anti-Americanism among the Indian people. Alas, nowhere else on earth are America's motives more suspect; nowhere else are we more disliked—except in the Soviet Union itself—than in India. Yet, I do not say that nations—particularly those struggling to find their way—should be pressured into joining us as allies. Such tactics would only alienate our friends. What I do say is that these nations, while professing neutrality, should not be openly hostile in word or deed while supping at our table. When has Nehru ever indicated his support for our position, as opposed to the Soviets, on vital international issues? No propaganda against us is too extreme for Indian acceptance, whether it be bacteriological warfare, or racial hatred. Oh, I know, we are told we must not expect the Indians to take our side; our objective must be only to maintain India's independence. This, it is asserted, will be a victory for the free world. I can agree with that proposition, Mr. President; but I submit that there is not a scintilla of evidence to demonstrate that we are unable to achieve the very same result, perhaps even more effectively, by means other than this incredible squandering of public money. If that be our objective, we are not only pursuing wrong methods, but we are paying a fantastic price.

Much the same can be said for our policy in Indonesia. In our supreme altruism, we literally tore that archipelago from the Netherlands, before the native population was ready for the responsibilities of nationhood. Yet there,

too, we not only will not win any popularity contest, but the coloration of Indonesia's political future is altogether obscure.

Mr. President, when I reflect upon the myopic course of our policies in the Far East, I am depressed. We started making mistakes with respect to China and Japan back in 1931, and apparently we have not learned anything from the errors of the past 25 years. Those mistakes embroiled us in a war with Japan. They involved us in a terrible war with Communist China which, as I see it, could have been avoided by a sound policy toward the Chinese Communist government at the beginning, no matter how much we detested it.

Why has not someone had the courage to get up on this floor and admit that we made a ghastly blunder in our China policy after the Communists gained control of the mainland? With 96 Senators in this Chamber, why have not any of us attempted to challenge the course which both Democratic and Republican administrations have clung to as gospel since 1950, so that the barest suggestion that there might have been an alternative is treated as heresy? Why did we not perceive, once China had fallen to the Communists, that we had an opportunity to help shape the future course of that country—even though it be Communist—in ways less detrimental to our security than the course we have pursued?

Why could not we realize, Mr. President, that it was to our national interest to drive a wedge between Stalin and Mao Tze-tung, to win the Chinese leader over to our side, or at least to a neutral position, instead of driving him closer and closer to the Soviet Union by a blind-alley concept of foreign relations? Why could not we have sought to make China less instead of more dependent upon the Soviet Union? When the Communist regime took over, they were starting almost from scratch, industrially. It might have been American equipment, American technicians, American replacement parts on which the government of Mao has to rely. Now it is probably too late to salvage anything from this self-defeating policy. We are stuck with it.

Oh, I know, we do not like Red China. We do not like murderous revolutionaries, gangsters, and criminals. But it was not so long ago, Mr. President, that we felt the same way about the Japanese people, and about the German people. They, too, were barbarians. They conducted a Bataan death march, remember? They raped our nurses; they burned people in gas chambers. Yet today we have clasped them to our bosom as defenders of the free way of life.

It is no tribute to statesmanship to make enemies, or to keep them when it is no longer in the national interest. And it is stupidity to retain a policy when events make clear that the policy injures the national interest. That point, I submit, has been reached with respect to our foreign aid program, as it has been operated in the Far East and in Europe.

It is anything but reassuring to survey the results of that program in Europe. I have already referred to Yugoslavia.

Perhaps the recent realignment of Tito with the Soviet Union—and make no mistake about it, it is a realignment—could have been anticipated in view of Yugoslavia's evolving trade pattern. Last year, the U. S. S. R. was fifth in importance among all Yugoslav markets. A considerable increase in that trade is inevitable as a result of its latest, extensive credit agreements with the Soviet bloc. Foreign aid put Yugoslavia back on its feet—so that it could march side by side with the U. S. S. R. in a more proliferating pan-Russian commonwealth.

One of the principal beneficiaries of the aid program in Europe has been France. Since 1949, the French have received from us over \$3 billion in military assistance and approximately \$3.2 billion in straight economic aid. About \$500 million in military aid from 1950-56 funds is still to be delivered. In addition to all this, Mr. President, we gave them during fiscal 1955 and fiscal 1956 something over \$800 million in military supplies specifically for the conduct of their war in Indochina. This comes to a grand total of over \$7.5 billion for France alone, since 1949. All of this, of course, came out of the pocket of the American taxpayer.

Now, just what did all that financial and military support accomplish? Is the French internal political and economic situation more favorable than it was when the program was started? Has the French economy been placed upon a sounder footing? Or would it not be in a healthier position today if the French people had been forced by circumstances to put their own house in order, as did the Belgians and Dutch, who suffered great devastation?

Mr. President, I was always under the impression that the purpose of granting military aid to France, at least initially, was to strengthen that country as a force for NATO and the defense of Europe. How has France used this strength? It has been spewed out on the battlefields of a colonial war in Indochina which became transmuted into another war with the Chinese Communists. Hundreds of millions of dollars in equipment were abandoned in Vietnam, and are still in the process of being recovered by our military teams.

At the present time, France is using our military aid to retain control over her colonial empire in Algeria—or to suppress an insurrection—depending upon the way one looks at it. And today, France is a weak link in NATO. My personal conviction is that so far as another war in Europe is concerned, we have no business counting on the French military power for any purpose. This is a simple sociological deduction, drawn, among other things, from the awesome bloodletting France sustained in the First World War, and the history of the Second World War.

Mr. President, I have no desire to extend this review of the reasons why I am voting against the foreign-aid program. But there are some hard facts upon which we must reflect before deciding to continue a policy as demonstrably ineffectual as this one. The facts are these:

From 1940 to 1955, we furnished a net total of over \$94 billion in aid to other governments. If we include the amounts expended during the current fiscal year, that total becomes more than \$101 billion. Do all of us fully realize what this means to the people of the United States? Taking an average population base of 140 million people during that 15-year period, every man, woman, and child in our country contributed over \$720 to foreign aid. In somewhat different terms, from the pockets of every family of four persons, the Government seized over \$2,880 to provide for the common defense and promote the general welfare of nations all over the globe. Think of it, Mr. President: almost \$3,000 per family. And this was saddled on the American taxpayer in addition to \$12 billion in grants and credits which we furnished to Europe after World War I, when the dollar had far more value.

We who are the elected agents of the people in Congress are the custodians of their wealth. This wealth is a sacred public trust. I dispute bitterly that we are discharging our trust when we invite every nation on earth to drain the people's birthright for this foreign-aid program.

There is so much that needs to be done inside our own country for the welfare of our people—apart from building American military might—which only a small portion of this money could accomplish. One-tenth of the sum thus far expended would have paid enormous dividends in medical research, and directly contributed to the strength of America. Mr. President, there are over 9 million of our people who are receiving treatment for arthritis. Five million of these individuals require financial assistance, if they are to be treated. The incidence of heart disease and cancer is too familiar to require comment here. Does anyone doubt that a fraction of the sum spent on foreign aid would have permitted great strides to be made in conquering these ailments, as we are now eradicating polio?

It was not long ago that we were very complacent about our technological advancement. Suddenly we find that Soviet output of highly skilled engineers far exceeds our own. We are in short supply, while the Soviets have an exportable surplus. We should be investing money in projects designed to overcome our deficiencies in the training of engineers and technical personnel, if we are to meet this Soviet challenge. And we should be spending it on crash programs in aircraft and missiles, as well as atomic development, before the Soviets have achieved a decisive advantage, if they have not already done so.

I see very little in the record to induce me to accept blindly assertions from any quarter, whether it be military or political, about our alleged superiority in atomic or other weapons over the Soviet Union. Last year—according to information given us when the foreign-aid bill was being considered—we were supposed to possess a vast margin of superiority over the Soviet Union in long-range bombers, and an almost unchallengeable position with respect to medium bombers. Yet where are we, in fact, today?

According to the most reliable figures available, the United States has 1 wing of B-52's—between 35 to 45 planes—that are combat ready, in comparison with some 90 to 100 Soviet bombers in the same class. In the medium bomber category, the Russians are rapidly overhauling us, with 2,000 planes to our 3,000. Our vaunted primacy of B-47's has dwindled to 1,000 airplanes. In the remaining two important categories, we are an also-ran. The Soviet light jet bombers outnumber ours by a margin of 5 to 1; and in the vital combat category of jet fighters, the Soviet planes outnumber ours by a margin of at least 7 to 1, for in this category the Soviets possess from 12,000 to 15,000 planes. On Tuesday, it was reported from the Moscow air show that the Soviets had unveiled a supersonic twin-engine bomber, something we do not yet have.

All of us are aware of these facts. I think we can also assume that the regime which turned out the MIG-15, can also make first-rate bombers. The truth of the matter is that the Soviets have been quietly pushing a crash program in air power, in atomic power, and in naval power, ever since the end of the World War II.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PASTORE in the chair). The time yielded to the Senator from North Dakota has expired.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I yield 1 more minute on the bill to the Senator from North Dakota, so that his speech may be completed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized for an additional minute on the bill.

The legislative clerk read the remainder of Mr. LANGER's speech, as follows:

Mr. LANGER. To what have we been devoting the maximum of our effort? To foreign aid. This foreign aid will, indeed, be great protection for our surface vessels against Russian submarines.

Mr. President, the battle with Soviet communism is being lost in the schools of this Nation; it is being lost in our laboratories; and it is being lost in our aircraft factories. But what is much worse, that battle is being lost on the floor of the Senate. If the foreign-aid program could be said to have created even a small portion of the security it was supposed to provide, I might feel differently about the cost to our people. What is so serious is that we could have developed a much more impregnable position in force—which the Russian leaders understand—with far less drain on our people.

I have no illusions, Mr. President, that anything I may say here will prevent the passage of this bill. Yet my convictions compel me to vote against it. I must vote against it because only if we deprive our policy planners of the means to perpetuate the foreign-aid program will they perhaps be driven to develop a foreign policy which will be truly in the national interest, a foreign policy which will take the place of the miserable excuse for sound and diplomatic action embodied in the foreign-aid program.

Following the reading of Mr. LANGER's speech,

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). The Senator from Alabama will state it.

Mr. SPARKMAN. From whose time would the time required for a quorum call be taken?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from North Dakota has no time which can be used for a quorum call.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I shall take only a little time to discuss the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota to the committee amendment, because I think all the pertinent facts were well presented to the Senate during the debate on yesterday by the very able chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the other members of the Foreign Relations Committee and other Members of the Senate.

The net effect of the amendment submitted by the distinguished Senator from North Dakota would be to cut the amount requested by the administration by \$1,400,000,000. The amendment would cut it \$1 billion below the amount reported by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, and would cut it \$400 million below the amount voted by the House of Representatives.

I certainly believe that a majority of the Senate would feel that such a cut as that would be entirely too drastic.

Furthermore, it would be a blanket cut, and I wish to point out that there is no way of knowing where it would apply; although by the very nature of the bill itself, the principal cut would come in the military aid item, because 80 or 85 percent of the program consists of military aid. A great part of that military aid—much greater than has been the case in past acts providing mutual-security funds—goes to Asia, and particularly to Formosa and some of the other countries in that area, which I believe the great majority of the Senate would like to see strengthened. The same thing is true with reference to Korea.

Only a little more than a year ago the Senate virtually handed to the President of the United States the right to use American forces in Korea if necessary to defend that country. The purpose of the heavy aid which we offer to Formosa in the pending bill is to provide for the building up of the strength of that country. I think it is certainly not stretching the imagination to say that it might mean the difference between the ability of Formosa to defend itself, and our having to use American boys to defend Formosa, which the Sen-

ate indicated its willingness to do a little more than a year ago.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that only a few days ago the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, said that this appropriation could easily stand a \$1 billion cut?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I did not talk with the Senator from Georgia myself, but I saw him quoted in the press. I take it for granted that that is his personal view. The distinguished Senator from Georgia, whom we all admire and respect, was expressing his own personal opinion. He did not sit through the hearings in the Foreign Relations Committee during the weeks we sat there.

Furthermore, the distinguished Senator from North Dakota knows that we invited the Senator from Georgia to appear before the Foreign Relations Committee and state his views. I do not know why he did not appear. Be that as it may, I was pointing out the fact that a great part of this money does go to such places as Formosa and Korea. We are called upon to support those countries. They are maintaining their own defense, but a burden is imposed on their economies which they are unable to carry without the funds provided in this bill.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Is it not true that yesterday the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], chairman of the Armed Services Committee, voted for a cut of nearly \$2 billion proposed by the Senators from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. LONG]?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; but I am not certain he would have done so had he attended the hearings of the Committee on Foreign Relations and studied the problem at first hand, as our committee did. The majority of the committee decided on the action which should be taken on this bill.

Mr. President, I merely wished to point out those few facts. I am not adding anything to what has been said before. We are confronted with a problem. No one wishes to see the continuation of this program beyond the time when it is absolutely necessary. Every one of us would like to see the appropriation reduced as much as it can be reduced. After hearing the testimony, and after discussing it among ourselves, the decision which the Committee on Foreign Relations reached was that in these perilous times the program could not stand any such cut as has been proposed.

Mr. President, it is not my desire to take any further time of the Senate. Unless some other Senator wishes to speak against the amendment, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Montana will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 11 (c), on page 52, line 19, in the committee amendment before the word "substitute", it is proposed to insert the following: "strike out 'section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955 (Public Law 778, 83d Cong.)' and insert 'section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956 (Public Law 208, 84th Cong.)'."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

This is purely a technical amendment to the bill as reported by the committee.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I should like to know the date and designation of this amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If the Senator will hear me through, I will explain it.

Mr. FLANDERS. I merely wish to know what we are talking about.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The amendment has not been printed.

This amendment would correct an error in the bill. Section 11 (c) of the bill contains an amendment to section 548 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954 extending for another year the limitation of section 548 on the amount of unobligated and unreserved funds which may be carried forward to the fiscal year 1957. Section 548 now refers to section 110 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1955—Public Law 778, 83d Congress. This reference is now out of date because section 110 was repealed by and is now superseded by section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956—Public Law 208, 84th Congress. Section 548 should therefore be corrected to refer to section 108 of the Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956. This amendment will make that correction.

I repeat that this amendment is of a purely technical, perfecting character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is time desired on the other side?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, under the circumstances, after listening to the description of the amendment by the distinguished Senator from Montana, I see no objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana desire further time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield back the remaining time on this side.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 9 (b) on page 38, line 4, in the committee amendment it is proposed to strike out the remainder of the sentence after the word "Congress," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "strike out 'Joint Committee on the Economic Report' and insert 'Joint Economic Committee and the Senate Select Committee on Small Business.'"

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, this is a technical amendment. Only a few days ago the President signed an act changing the name of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report to the Joint Economic Committee. This amendment would merely correct the name of the committee in the bill.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I can see no possible objection to the amendment. If the Senator from Alabama will yield back his time, I will yield back all my time.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield back all my time.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield back all time on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been exhausted or yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] on the bill.

SENATOR GEORGE SOUNDS TRUMPET CALL TO FREE WORLD

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, no one could have heard the eloquent address by the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] on June 27 without being impressed. I am convinced that this great patriot voiced the best interests of our country and of the free world when he urged that we continue the programs which have been so successful in recent years toward helping other nations in their efforts to build a stronger economic future for their peoples, and toward joining many of them in building defenses against the military threats of Soviet and Chinese expansionism. The Nation is, indeed, fortunate that the eminent chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee has undertaken an important new role in the essential task of the further development of the Atlantic Community, which is the core of these defensive arrangements and of the whole free and democratic world.

For the reasons advanced so ably by Senator GEORGE, I intend, without partisanship, to support the Eisenhower administration in its requests for the continued operation of the mutual security system. Costly as this system is, Mr. President, it is 100 times preferable—nay, 1,000 times preferable—to an armed garrison state or to an ultimate withering, catastrophic war.

However, Mr. President, many residents of my region are disturbed over one inconsistency between the administration's domestic policies and its mutual security program. They do not understand why that program encourages and supports with United States funds the construction of multipurpose hydroelectric power and irrigation projects in foreign lands, while the Eisenhower administration regards the investment of the United States funds in such projects under the same circumstances as inimical to the welfare of our own Nation.

WHY HIGH DAMS FOR FORMOSA, BUT NOT FOR NORTHWEST?

Because of the beneficence of the Almighty, the American Northwest is blessed by the presence of the mightiest source of waterpower on our continent. More than 40 percent of the potential hydroelectricity of the United States lurks within the watershed of the Columbia River. This vast stream carries down to the sea 180,000,000 acre-feet of water. It is as much as the key to the economic future of our as yet undeveloped region as any similar river system abroad.

But, Mr. President, this administration has decided that public investment in dams to tap the water resources of the Columbia Basin for power, navigation, and flood control is adverse to our country's best interests, being even so-called creeping socialism.

I do not understand, Mr. President, how this same administration can promote in Egypt, in Formosa, in Afghanistan, in Rhodesia, a policy which the administration considers unfit and unsound in the United States of America.

Therefore, Mr. President, I intend to put to the administration—and to its supporters and spokesmen in this Chamber—a series of questions concerning its promotion of multipurpose power projects under the mutual security system, elsewhere in the world. I want to offer the spokesmen for the administration's policies this opportunity to explain this evident inconsistency. The replies should prove of immense interest to the residents of my State, who have been denied Federal development of the resources of the Columbia Basin by the policies of the Eisenhower administration.

These are some of the questions which I am voicing with respect to the curious contradiction of an administration which thinks United States investment in high dams for power and irrigation is fine for overseas but bad for the United States.

GOVERNMENT POWER ABROAD BUT NO FEDERAL PROJECTS AT HOME

First. From time to time, tables have been inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD showing the extent to which United States foreign-aid funds have, over the past 7 or 8 years, gone into the development of water resources abroad for reclamation, irrigation, and hydroelectric power; and I suppose it is fair to say that such projects are not only consistent with, but are actually among the best examples of our policy to aid the basic, long-term development of under-

developed regions. Is it not the case that this policy will be continued, and that substantial sums under the authorization bill before us may be spent on such water-resources projects?

Second. Does the United States Government impose any conditions whatever on the ownership and control of these projects overseas which are financed by American aid funds, or, for example, of the power generated at them? Is it not a fact that in almost every instance major power dams and reclamation projects abroad are built and controlled by the recipient government? Who will receive the power revenues from these projects?

Third. Much overseas investment of United States assistance funds is channeled through the World Bank—an independent organization financed primarily by the United States. A few days ago, the World Bank signed a loan of \$80,000,000 with the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland to build the 500,000-kilowatt Kariba project on the Zambesi River, which will finally cost about \$225,000,000. Similarly, both the United States and World Bank assistance has been offered to Egypt for the Aswan project—the high dam on the Nile River. We have also recently undertaken to aid new water-resource developments on Formosa and, I believe, in Afghanistan. Are we insisting that there be participation by private electric utility companies in these projects, built with United States funds, in Egypt? In Formosa? In Afghanistan? In Rhodesia-Nyasaland?

MUTUAL SECURITY SHOULD NOT RULE OUT SAME POLICY HERE

Fourth. Before Federal investment is undertaken in a proposed project inside of this country, the appropriate Federal agencies make exhaustive studies to establish the benefit-cost ratios and the economic feasibility and desirability of such projects. In the case of United States assistance to similar projects abroad, what United States agency assumes responsibility for determining these data before the investment of United States aid funds?

The Department of State no doubt lacks its own experts in these fields. Is it not the case, then, that in underwriting hydroelectric and similar water development projects abroad, we rely on the recipient government to decide where it thinks government funds need to be invested for the best development of its country's resources?

Fifth. In other words, both in our own foreign assistance policies, as in the present bill, and through the World Bank, we encourage governmental projects abroad, without any protests against socialism, or that the government concerned should really let private companies do the job better. How does this square with the administration's attitude toward development of our own American water resources?

Sixth. The Senate is aware that power facilities in most Federal river projects in the United States fully repay the Federal taxpayers' investment, with interest. How do the administration and its spokesmen explain and justify a policy which refuses necessary Federal investment in resource development in our own

country, where it would be fully repaid with interest—while making such investments of United States funds in similar projects abroad, which are not to be repaid to the United States? Why this Jekyll and Hyde procedure?

Seventh. I repeat, I support our policy of assisting underdevelopment nations to build the foundations of a modern economy through development of their own natural resources. But in the light of this policy, can the administration, in all fairness, offer any defense to its criticism, as being socialistic and inconsistent with Americanism, of the investment of Federal funds in underdeveloped regions of our own country? Are high dams for export only?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I would like to express my hope and my concern that the economic assistance we give under this bill will actually benefit the average people of the nations to whom the aid goes—for it is these average people, not their rulers, on whom we must rely for future friends and allies in the world, and on whose future depends the fate of mankind, of which they are the largest part. Some of the recent reports of the actual effects of our aid programs have stressed the difficulties and the problems created in the process of applying large-scale American aid in underdeveloped countries in Asia.

For example, in a recent book entitled "Hunza: Lost Kingdom of the Himalayas," Dr. John Clark, a geologist, calls attention to the fact that much of our economic aid fails to make an impression on local communities—at the level of the village and other small units of population, the support of which is probably essential to the ultimate success of our whole foreign assistance program. An example of the problems thus created is also set forth in an illuminating article entitled "Lesson in Foreign Aid Policy," by Peggy and Pierre Streit, in the New York Times Sunday magazine for March 18, 1956. I ask unanimous consent that this article, slightly abridged, be printed in the RECORD at this point, followed by a book review of Dr. Clark's book by Mr. Orville Prescott from the New York Times of June 11, 1956.

There being no objection, the article and book review were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of March 18, 1956]

LESSON IN FOREIGN AID POLICY: THE LARGEST AMERICAN-SPONSORED DEVELOPMENT IN ASIA PROMISED MUCH TO AFGHANISTAN, INSTEAD IT HAS BECOME A BURDEN AND A WARNING NOT TO TRY TOO MUCH TOO SOON

(By Peggy and Pierre Streit)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—The Helmand Valley irrigation project, the largest American-financed and constructed development in Asia, was conceived in 1950 as a boon to the people of Afghanistan. Since then, this boon has become a bitter burden that seriously threatens the Afghan economy and presents the United States with a critical problem in a politically strategic area.

The history of the Helmand Valley project is timely and valuable for two reasons. First, most of its problems are encountered again and again in underdeveloped countries. And, second, the American techniques of foreign aid, employed with dubious success in Afghanistan, are being used elsewhere in the Middle East and Asia.

American foreign aid policies are now undergoing critical reappraisal in Washington. To a large extent the story of this important but little known project can help make future aid programs more effective.

Afghanistan is a landlocked country, bordered on the north by Russia, on the west by Iran and on the east and south by Pakistan. Her geographical position has long isolated her people, both physically and culturally, from the social and technological developments of both East and West.

Recently, however, with the awakening of the Middle East and Asian countries, Afghanistan has begun to seek economic development of her potentially rich land, primarily by harnessing the waters of her turbulent Helmand River. This river has its source in the Hindu Kush Mountains and then winds for 800 miles through southern Afghanistan into Iran.

Before World War II, the Afghan Government hired Japanese technicians to begin work on a large canal designed to tap waters of the Helmand for cultivation. Work, interrupted by the war, was resumed shortly thereafter, this time with the help of the Morrison-Knudson Co., an American construction firm hired by the Afghan Government. By 1949, however, the Afghans had vastly increased the scope of their plans. They now envisioned the Helmand River project as providing a firm water supply, hydroelectric power, flood control, improvement of old river land and development of approximately 500,000 acres of new land. Here the Afghans hoped to settle a large percentage of their two million nomads, whose perennial wanderings represent a severe drain on the Afghan economy, if not a complete loss.

The Government of Afghanistan turned to the United States Export-Import Bank for assistance in this vast undertaking. In requesting a loan, it sought aid only for the construction of major works—the dams and principal canals. The Afghans undertook to do the rest—to bring the water from the main canals to the land, to prepare the new lands for cultivation, and to settle the nomads. In 1950, on the basis of these assurances and the fact that Afghanistan had a tidy dollar reserve accumulated during the war years, the bank granted a loan of \$21.5 million for the development of the Helmand Basin. The loan stipulated that an American constructing company should do the work, and Morrison-Knudson, already on the scene, was hired.

M-K brought to Afghanistan the efficiency of American private enterprise. It acquired its equipment, from nails to 25-ton trucks, from the United States in record time and was able to work steadily without the onerous handicap of having to apply to Congress each year for funds. It utilized the full talents and capabilities of local Afghan labor by establishing a training program, thus substantially reducing costs. Construction costs were held to American standards despite the fact that all equipment had to be shipped 8,000 miles. Two large dams and the irrigation network were completed months ahead of schedule.

Where once there was parched, brown Afghan earth there are now two fresh, blue lakes, and cranes and ducks are nesting where only the desert fox could live. For the first time farmers can rely on a steady supply of water from the Helmand. Last year a drought year, these waters saved a large part of Afghanistan's fruit crop. And whereas in the past farmers have barely been able to reap one crop, they now almost doubled their produce with two yearly plantings. But as Morrison-Knudson's work progressed, the portent of a major economic and political crisis began to appear. It became sharply and tragically apparent that the persons who granted the loan, like the Afghans who accepted it, had failed to evaluate the country's ability, economically and socially, to

handle the problems created by such an extensive undertaking.

It became apparent that the Helmand Valley Authority, the Afghan organization created to take over the operation and maintenance of the irrigation network, to prepare the new lands for cultivation and to settle them, had no trained men to assume these responsibilities. Furthermore, the inadequate Afghan educational system offered little hope of obtaining these men. At the time HVA was to assume operation, it had one trained engineer and one trained agriculturalist, both fresh from foreign schools and with no practical experience. The Afghan Government gradually realized that the operation of hydraulic valves, the determination of proper water distribution, and the maintenance of a tremendous network of canals was a highly complex job and that misuse of equipment and canals could seriously damage or destroy both.

Furthermore, it also became clear that the newly settled nomad farmers had no conception of the proper use of either land or water. Men who for centuries had used the most primitive agricultural methods and had thirsted for water did not understand the importance either of leveling the land or of leaching it of its salt content. Suddenly endowed with an abundance of water, they drowned their land, raising its salt content to the point of ruin. This land can be reclaimed, but the process is expensive and until the Afghan farmer learns how to use his newly acquired treasures, reclamation will be useless.

Some of the newly developed desert lands have also proved of inferior quality and unsuited for cultivation unless very expertly handled. By ill fortune, the very first tracts to be settled and cultivated have been particularly difficult. Though extensive soil surveys ordinarily precede an irrigation project, these surveys had not been considered feasible in the case of the Helmand because of their complicated and time-consuming nature. Thus, nomads, lured from their old life by promises of a new one of ease and plenty, have been settled on lands that offer a hard and meager existence. Some of them have already abandoned the valley to return to their ancient nomadic wanderings.

Despite these ominous developments, the Afghan Government, having used up its first loan, turned to the Export-Import Bank for another to push the project through. In 1954, the bank, primarily to safeguard its initial investment, granted the country a second loan of \$18.5 million. To date, however, there has been no decisive improvement in the Helmand Valley project, and the very magnitude of the unforeseen difficulties has created a major political crisis in Afghanistan.

Under the terms of the loan, Afghanistan has paid all local construction and operation costs as her share of the project expenses. These have amounted to about one-third of the Afghan yearly budget of approximately \$24 million—or what to Afghanistan is the staggering sum of \$8 million a year. Thus, an overwhelming sum has been and is likely to continue to be spent on an undertaking which so far has yielded no revenue and which is not likely to yield any soon.

In consequence, the Helmand Valley project, which was to have been a boon to Afghanistan, has today placed a dangerous strain both on the Afghan economy and on the nation's morale. Some Western observers in Kabul reason that recent Afghan-Russian trade agreements and the Afghan acceptance of a \$100 million Soviet credit represent a partial attempt to mitigate this plight. If this is so, the United States may have unwittingly and indirectly contributed to driving Afghanistan into Russian arms.

The current state of Afghan fears and disillusionment over the outcome of the Helmand Valley project is indicated by the fact that no word of it is being published in the

local newspapers and by the further fact that no key figure in the present Afghan Cabinet has journeyed the 400 miles from the capital to see the project. American observers guess that top Afghan officials are afraid to associate themselves too closely with such a precarious enterprise.

There are persistent rumors that the Cabinet is considering dropping the development as too big to handle. But strong pressures so far have prevented this. The Afghans have invested too much money to permit their withdrawal. And to abandon the settlement project is to lose face with and control of the nomads, an eventuality Kabul dares not risk.

In their distress over the failures of the project, the Afghans, not unnaturally, have laid much of the blame on those most closely associated with it. These are the Export-Import Bank, which the Afghans somehow feel made an injudicious loan, and the Morrison-Knudson Co., which the Afghans rightly or wrongly hold responsible for the development of some of the inferior lands. But to Afghan eyes these two organizations are synonymous with the American Government. This conviction was further strengthened when the International Cooperation Administration, the foreign-aid arm of the United States Government, began work in Afghanistan in 1952.

Hence, whether Afghan logic is valid or not, in the eyes of Afghanistan, as well as the Middle East and Asia, the good name of the United States is now vitally at stake in the Helmand Valley—and at a time when the Soviet Union is entering the foreign-aid field, not only in Afghanistan but throughout Asia.

ICA faces overwhelming problems in Afghanistan, and particularly in the Helmand Valley. It must work with an almost illiterate people, overcome the language barrier, cope with Washington bureaucracy, and meet many bitter and accumulated problems inherited from a project it had no part in creating. Where responsibility rests for the existing confusion and inefficiency is open to question. But the fact clearly remains that the help Afghanistan needs she is not getting, and the Helmand Valley has profited relatively little from ICA's presence there.

Could the United States have been spared the crisis it now faces in Afghanistan? Four agencies have been involved in the Helmand Valley project, yet it does not seem that full responsibility can be attributed to any one of them.

Undoubtedly the Afghan Government overestimated its ability to cope with such a massive project. But having been long isolated from the rest of the world and having no previous experience with large-scale developments, Afghanistan can hardly be blamed for her lack of knowledge.

The Morrison-Knudson Co. did recognize some of the inherent hazards of the undertaking. But M. K., as a private organization, had responsibility only for a construction job and not for its economic and political consequences.

The United States Export-Import Bank, in granting the first loan, dealt with the project primarily as a banking venture. It could not fully examine the consequences of the loan, nor did it feel called upon to assume responsibility for them.

The American Embassy in Afghanistan was extremely small when the initial loan was made. It had no staff to make extensive appraisals of the project. Furthermore, Afghanistan was then far outside the pale of the primary preoccupations of American foreign policy. At the time of the second loan, the die had been cast—American interests appeared so deeply involved in Afghanistan that there was little choice but to continue with the project.

In short, there was no single agency charged with the responsibility for investi-

gating the long-range consequences of this giant American-financed venture.

What has been learned by 5 years of bitter experience in Afghanistan?

One lesson seems clear: A prerequisite of future extensive economic development projects in Asia and the Middle East is a thorough evaluation of the economic and social tolerance of a given country for a given project. One thing that must be guarded against is doing too much too soon. Furthermore, it seems apparent that overall authority and responsibility for this work and supervising the projects as they progress must be vested in a suitable agency.

It should also be recognized that the techniques of American foreign aid which were effective in Europe, where the foreign-aid program was born, do not necessarily apply in Asia. In Europe trained technicians existed; all they needed was up-to-date technical advice. In Asia these trained technicians seldom exist, and American technical advisers find themselves with no one to advise. Thus, American foreign-aid policies must be revised to permit American technicians to operate projects until the nationals of the assisted country have had sufficient time and training to utilize American advice. This indicates that an economic development project has little practical use in Asia unless it is supplemented with a training program geared to produce the personnel needed to operate it.

The United States must also accept the fact that its prestige will inevitably be at stake wherever any American organization, public or private, engages in development projects in this part of the world.

And, finally, the United States Government and the American people must reconcile themselves to the fact that the much-needed foreign-aid program in underdeveloped countries of Asia and the Middle East is a herculean task, long range in nature, fraught with frustration and criticism, with results that, by American standards, are bound to be agonizingly slow.

Perhaps the most important lesson the Helmand Valley project can teach is that the United States still has much to learn about helping others to help themselves.

[From the New York Times of June 11, 1956]

BOOKS OF THE TIMES

(By Orville Prescott)

Dr. John Clark, "a middle-aged geologist, a specialist on deserts and fossil bones, a bachelor, is a man with the courage of his convictions and an exceptional determination to practice what he preaches. Convinced of the need for the United States to make friends among undeveloped countries of Asia and of the need to help them to improve their shaky economies, Dr. Clark is also convinced that the point 4 program is not the best way to do it.

Six years ago, when no department of the Government would back his offer to demonstrate a better way in the remote Kingdom of Hunza, Dr. Clark formed a small foundation of his own that raised enough money for him to devote 20 months to a 1-man mission helping the Hunza people to help themselves. In Hunza: Lost Kingdom of the Himalayas, Dr. Clark has written an interesting account of his experience. It is also a challenging argument for a new approach to the United States system of foreign aid.

PIONEERING IN A PRIMITIVE LAND

The Kingdom of Hunza lies in the shadow of the Karakorum Mountains in Pakistan-held Northern Kashmir. A little larger than New Jersey, it is so barren that the population of 25,000 dwells in a series of oases surrounded by desolate mountains. Foreign affairs and defense are controlled by Pakistan, but the King, or Mir, is an absolute monarch. The Hunzas are a pre-Bronze Age people, who

have never learned to fashion metals or pottery. They speak 11 languages, belong to the Ismailian Moslem sect, and earn an average annual income of \$20 a family. Their scanty pasture land is deteriorating, their water supply is decreasing, and the population is growing rapidly. There is little wood in Hunza and no other source of heat. Unable to raise enough food, the Hunzas endure a period of semistarvation every spring.

When Dr. Clark settled down in the capital city of Baltit the Mir allowed him to live in a 600-year-old castle. There Dr. Clark ran a medical dispensary and treated from 25 to 60 persons a day. He established a craft school in woodworking. He distributed vegetable seeds and he made a geological survey of Hunza. An expert on first aid and a student of anatomy, Dr. Clark treated a variety of diseases and suffered from many himself—malaria, beri-beri, mild heart attacks, and dysentery.

Many of the Hunzas are intelligent and anxious to learn. But all of them are steeped in Asiatic fatalism, in a passive and submissive attitude toward life. They were so accustomed to being cold all winter that they didn't try to keep themselves warm.

"Sahib," a peasant said, "the river is cutting away my field, and I wish you'd come and look at it."

"Look," I told him, "you see that gravel bar across the river? You and your neighbors start on the downstream side and carry away boulders until you've cut a channel right across the bar. Then the water will flow in the channel and will stop cutting here."

"That's fine!" he said happily. "Please ask the Mir Sahib to order us to do it and we will."

"Would the Mir be angry if you did this on your own initiative?"

"Oh, not at all. It is merely our custom never to do anything unless the Mir orders us."

Dr. Clark considers his influence on the nine boys who lived with him and studied carpentry the most important result he accomplished in Hunza. A trade was useful. Far more important was learning to think for themselves, acquiring self-confidence and self-respect, becoming dissatisfied with their immemorial misery and anxious to take positive steps to improve matters.

BASIS FOR BETTERMENT SET FORTH

These new attitudes could come, Dr. Clark says, only after the boys had absorbed five others that are the basis of Western progress and are alien to traditional Asiatic ways—objectivity, dissatisfaction, creative confidence, individuality, and responsibility.

Although Dr. Clark was the object of suspicion, malicious rumors, and official obstruction, he is positive that his approach was the right one.

"If you want to make friends with any people, you cannot do it by working through their government or their political parties," he insists. He adds:

"Let us stop at once the ruinous system of large, direct gifts from the American Government to Asian governments. Such gifts are expensive to us and always breed avarice and resentment on the part of the recipients. * * * All projects should be on a scale the local community can absorb, but conducted on a wide geographic basis. No \$20 million steel mills, but rather \$20,000 projects in a thousand villages. * * * Any major industrial project which is economically unsound should receive no capital, because United States financing of noble but unsound projects leads to Asian inefficiency and bankruptcy, and to mutual ill-will. We cannot buy friends, and we should not stoop to attempt it."

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without the time being charged on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is designated "6-27-56-I."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator desire to have the amendment read, or to have it printed in the RECORD without being read?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment offered by Mr. KNOWLAND is as follows:

On page 55, after line 16, insert the following new section:

"COMMISSION ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

"SEC. 14. (a) It is the purpose of this section to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies and operations of our present and past foreign-aid programs, a means for—

"(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign-aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

"(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

"(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

"(b) To carry out the purpose set forth in subsection (a), there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission"). Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1764); nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 715), section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), or any other Federal law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

"(c) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

"(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

"(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

"(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives and 2 from private life.

Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made. The Chairman of the Commission shall be designated by the President. The Commission shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members. Seven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

"(d) Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission. Members of the Commission appointed from private life shall each receive \$75 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

"(e) The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The Commission may procure, without regard to the civil-service laws and the classification laws, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U. S. C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed \$75 per diem for individuals.

"(f) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

"(g) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign-aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information concerning—

"(1) The proper objectives of foreign-aid programs and the criteria which can be used to measure accomplishment.

"(2) The capability of the United States to extend aid, in terms of the Nation's economic technical, personnel, and other resources.

"(3) The need and willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

"(4) The various kinds of foreign aid and alternatives thereto as well as the methods by which the conditions on which aid might be furnished.

"(5) The related actions which should be taken to make foreign aid effective in achieving national objectives.

The Commission shall transmit to the President and to the Congress not later than February 15, 1957, the results of the study herein authorized together with such recommendations as it may consider to be desirable.

"(h) The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times

and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpoena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpoenas may be issued under the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U. S. C. 192-194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(1) The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this act; and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, with respect to the question of a study of the mutual-aid program, I believe there has been general unanimity of opinion that a study should be made. There is an honest difference of opinion as to how the study may best be conducted.

The executive branch of the Government, in a measure introduced in the other House, had proposed that congressional authorization be provided for a study to be made by an executive commission. This was not agreed to by either the House or the Senate. The reasons, I think, were several. One was the belief that the executive branch of the Government could set up a purely executive commission without the necessity of congressional authorization for it. Secondly, there was the feeling that Congress itself had a responsibility in this regard.

So far as a congressional survey is concerned, there are, of course, several steps or alternative procedures which might be taken, and there have been suggestions in both the Senate and the House as to how it might best be accomplished.

One approach is a study by the Foreign Relations Committee, or under its direction. This is the approach contained in the resolution offered by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] which has been reported to the Senate by the Foreign Relations Committee.

Another approach has been the suggestion that there be created a joint committee consisting of Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives. I believe that a resolution providing for such a joint committee has been introduced by the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN].

There have been other suggestions in the House. Of course, we have no jurisdiction over action by the House.

In my opinion, there is merit in all these approaches, and there are also dis-

advantages in all of them. Certainly the mutual-aid program is a matter which concerns the Congress of the United States as well as the Executive. For that reason, I did not believe the problem would be properly solved by merely having an executive agency conduct such a survey and such an investigation.

It seems to me that having the survey made only by members of the Foreign Relations Committee, as provided in the Mansfield resolution, does not meet the situation, because the problem is broader, it seems to me, than the jurisdiction of the Foreign Relations Committee alone, though I serve as a member of that committee. The Armed Services Committee has an interest. The Appropriations Committee, of course, has a vital interest. And over and above that, the entire Senate of the United States has a vital interest in this program. Of course, under our system, the House of Representatives, being co-equal with the Senate in the legislative arm of Government, has an equal interest in the matter.

That presents this question: Are we to have widespread duplication of effort? Will we have a House committee, a Senate committee, and maybe a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, one from the Appropriations Committee, and possibly a third one from the Armed Services Committee, all conducting surveys, all calling Government witnesses, all having to visit some of the areas where the mutual aid program is being carried on? Perhaps they could not cover all the bases, each would be looking at a little different set of facts; and finally, we would have 3 or 4 different reports from the representatives of the Senate, or the congressional committees, and a different set of facts presented by the executive branch of the Government.

Congress cannot write the ticket alone, because, as we know and as has been reiterated during the course of the debate, it is fundamental that under the Constitution the President, through his authorized representatives, conducts the Nation's foreign policy. But, obviously, likewise Congress is not prepared to surrender its prerogatives and responsibilities in this field, because, under the Constitution, Congress is a coequal branch of the Government and not a subordinate branch, and it has a vital responsibility in the control of the public pursestrings and the support of our armed services, all of which fit into this situation.

The Senate has a particular and peculiar responsibility in advising and consenting in connection with treaties and foreign policy generally.

The administration did not originally support the concept which I have presented in my amendment, which is really the concept of the Hoover Commission, if we may so term it. I should like to read the amendment. It is, in part, as follows:

SEC. 14. (a) It is the purpose of this section to insure the soundness and maximum effectiveness of any foreign-aid program in which the United States may hereafter be engaged by providing, on the basis of a detailed study and evaluation of the policies

and operations of our present and past foreign-aid programs, a means for—

(1) clarifying the objectives of any foreign-aid program of the United States, and the considerations which should govern the selection of methods and policies to attain those objectives;

(2) determining specific organizational standards, procedures, and practices to promote improved administration of any such program at the operational level; and

(3) developing a policy on foreign aid which will most effectively secure the implementation of such objectives while maintaining maximum economy and efficiency in all parts of the program at all levels of operation.

(b) To carry out the purpose set forth in subsection (a), there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Commission on Foreign Aid Programs (referred to hereinafter as the "Commission"). Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U. S. C. 99), or section 512 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended (22 U. S. C. 1764); nor shall such service be considered as employment or holding of office or position bringing such individual within the provisions of section 6 of the act of May 22, 1920, as amended (5 U. S. C. 715), section 212 of the act of June 30, 1932, as amended (5 U. S. C. 59a), or any other Federal law limiting the reemployment of retired officers or employees or governing the simultaneous receipt of compensation and retired pay or annuities.

(c) The Commission shall be composed of 12 members as follows:

(1) Four appointed by the President of the United States, 2 from the executive branch of the Government and 2 from private life;

(2) Four appointed by the President of the Senate, 2 from the Senate and 2 from private life; and

(3) Four appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 2 from the House of Representatives, and 2 from private life.

It provides that any vacancy which may occur shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

Mr. President, under date of June 27, 1956, the Secretary of State addressed the following letter to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE]:

This is in reply to your letter of June 14, 1956, in which you requested the views of the Department of State on S. 4035, introduced by Senator KNOWLAND, and your letters of June 15, in which you requested our views on Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, introduced by Senator MARTIN, and Senate Resolution 285 introduced by Senator MANSFIELD.

Senator KNOWLAND's bill would authorize the establishment by the President and the Congress of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs. Senator MARTIN's proposed concurrent resolution would establish a joint congressional committee to be known as the Joint Committee on Foreign Aid. Senator MANSFIELD's proposed Senate resolution directs the Foreign Relations Committee to arrange for studies of foreign aid.

You have addressed similar requests for comment to the Secretary of Defense and the Director of the International Cooperation Administration. They have asked me to express their views with mine in this single reply.

As you know, the executive branch is thoroughly in accord with the general objectives of each of the proposals. For some time we have advocated that a careful study be made of the mutual security program and of the best means of carrying it forward in the future. We have recommended the establishment of a nonpartisan committee of distinguished private citizens to make such a study and to report to the President and the Congress.

It is our view that of the various resolutions on which you have asked our comment, the proposal made by Senator KNOWLAND would most effectively, efficiently and economically serve the public interest.

This proposal would provide for the establishment of a 12-member commission. Four members would be appointed by the President, four by the President of the Senate, and four by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Of each group of four, two would be Members of the body involved, and two would be distinguished citizens in private life. This proposal would, therefore, seem to combine the essential features of the suggestions by Senator MARTIN in Senate Concurrent Resolution 82, and by Senator MANSFIELD, in Senate Resolution 285, that the study be carried out by Members of the Congress and the proposal of the President that a public commission be appointed from private life.

A Commission composed of persons chosen in this way would provide the broadest possible base for studying these important programs and the means by which they may be made most effective. Such a single group would, we believe, be inherently better able to carry out a coordinated study than would separate groups, designated by one or both Houses of the Congress and by the executive branch.

I am authorized by the President to say that he is in accord with the proposal for a Commission of this character and that if it is authorized the executive branch will participate in it actively.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. THYE. I commend the distinguished minority leader for having offered his amendment. I wish to associate myself as being in strong support or as being a cosponsor of it. I think the Senator is approaching the question in a most realistic manner. This approach will insure a nonpartisan attitude. Furthermore, it will assure not only legislative but also administrative and outside interests taking part in the study.

The report of such a Commission would certainly allay any fear on the part of the general public that foreign aid was a waste of the taxpayers' dollars, as is so often feared at present.

After such a Commission as is proposed by the amendment had a study and submitted its report, I believe it would secure for Congress in the next session not only strong support from the general public but an excellent understanding of what we were confronted with.

Again, I commend the Senator for offering the amendment. I think it is a wise course to pursue.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, it is most encouraging to note that my dis-

tinguished colleague, the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], has proposed an amendment to H. R. 11356 which would create a top-level bipartisan Commission to reexamine and re-evaluate our policies with respect to continued military and economic assistance, for it had been my intention to offer a similar amendment calling for the establishment of a Commission on Foreign Aid Programs.

I shall most certainly support the Senator's amendment, for I feel very strongly that an independent Commission, wholly free of all insinuation and suggestion of political bias, would be an eminently effective and forceful instrument to study and recommend our future course in the foreign-aid field.

A reappraisal of our current policies so that we may proceed intelligently is urgently needed. It is long overdue. Rapidly changing world conditions certainly warrant a comprehensive review. Even at this moment, some of our friends abroad are beguiled by sweet nothings from Moscow, and the tendency in Europe is to relax in the dream world of peaceful coexistence. These are but fleeting delusions.

In the Middle East, for example, saber rattling continues. Egyptian Premier Nasser and others act and talk aggressively. Munitions and implements of war from Iron Curtain countries contribute to the jingoism of the Arab States. We may find it necessary and quite compatible with our efforts for peaceful solution of Middle East tensions to counterbalance the shipment of arms to Egypt by supplying Israel with the weapons this nation has requested from our arsenal. Certainly no country, especially a friendly one, can be left to the mercy of Communist aggressive intentions. In addition, the recent realignment of relations between Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia has raised many questions which must be answered and created many doubts which must be resolved.

Until we determine our future policies on foreign military and economic assistance, I sincerely believe that in the light of possible consequences we should support the President. Those consequences encompass the probability of a reduction of military forces of our allies stationed in West Germany and other strategic spots. Even in the atomic age, the bastions of freedom require manpower. A drastic curtailment in foreign military assistance would provide an excuse for a reduction. This means that a much greater burden for defending these strategic positions would fall upon the United States. It would involve an expansion of our own military forces requiring the drafting and induction into the service of more of our own boys.

I, for one, would rather vote money sufficient for our allies to maintain their share of defending the free world against possible Communist attack than to pass that burden to our own soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. Let us not give our allies an excuse to pull back in these dangerous times.

These remarks, though brief, summarize my thinking on this very important

matter—a matter which strikes at the essence of freedom for peace-loving men and women everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD, three of my newsletters of recent date which deal with this matter.

There being no objection, the newsletters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE HORNS OF A DILEMMA

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, April 2, 1956.—Soon the Congress will again consider the matter of foreign aid. As now presented, the program involves requests for appropriations totalling about \$4.7 billion and authority to engage in long-term commitments estimated at \$100 million. The scope and size of this new proposal has many in a quandry, and approval is uncertain.

This dilemma stems from several factors. First, \$4.7 billion would exceed last year's appropriations by some \$2 billion. Second, unexpended foreign aid funds from previous appropriations total nearly \$4.5 billion. Third, although the original mutual aid program—the Marshall plan—was intended to last 4 years, various dangers are ascribed to any long-term policy.

In the past 15 years, the United States has assisted other countries, through grants and loans, to the sum of \$92 billion. Slightly more than half of this amount has been made available since World War II. Military assistance, technical cooperation, offshore procurement, development assistance, defense support, counterpart funds, direct forces support—these are the channels through which foreign aid is dispensed. Also, American dollars are provided through the international agencies—the International Monetary Fund; the International Labor Organization; the Organization of American States; various divisions of the United Nations; the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, to mention a few.

That these programs have been helpful, in varying degree, there can be little doubt. There is much agreement on this point. However, this same spirit of agreement does not exist on the idea of long-term commitments. Conceivably, in connection with vast projects such as the Aswan Dam in Egypt and development of the Mekong River in the Far East, obligations of an extended nature must be undertaken. But to eliminate the annual Congressional audit, and thus the traditional control of any part of mutual assistance funds would, it is generally believed, give a permanent set to our bountiful habits.

As a solution to this dilemma, it seems to me that an independent, bipartisan commission should be established, on a continuing basis, for the purpose of studying and evaluating the need, character, and extent of foreign aid in the light of changing domestic and world conditions. Inevitably, there must come a time when our offerings to other nations must be drastically reduced.

A PROPER COURSE OF ACTION

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, May 7, 1956.—In my newsletter of April 2, 1956, I suggested that "an independent bipartisan commission should be established on a continuing basis to evaluate the need, character and extent of foreign aid in the light of changing domestic and world conditions." The idea is by no means new, and in recent weeks, others, including Senator George, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, Secretary of State Dulles, and President Eisenhower

have voiced the need for a reappraisal of our aid programs.

When the Marshall plan was first conceived in 1947, Senator Arthur Vandenberg of Michigan proposed that a bipartisan advisory council of our ablest and most experienced citizenship be appointed to determine the extent to which the United States could safely and wisely engage in aid to foreign nations. He said further, " * * * I recognize that intelligent American self-interest immediately requires a second, overall inventory of our own resources to determine the latitudes within which we may consider these foreign needs. This comes first because if America ever sags, the world's hopes sag with her."

Accordingly, President Truman, in June of 1947, appointed not 1, but 3 committees, including a nonpartisan Advisory Council, to undertake this critical assignment of domestic and global impact. Out of these considerations came the framework of the Marshall plan (ECA) which was later approved by Congress.

With the approach of the expiration of ECA in 1952, Senator Vandenberg made a similar recommendation in these words, " * * * I think it would be well for another such commission, equally unpartisan and equally impeccable in character, to resume independent, advisory studies of our new responsibilities as the world's largest creditor nation and the world's spearhead in the quest of dependable peace. * * *"

That suggestion, in all of its wisdom and import is, in my judgment, as pertinent today as it was in 1952—especially in the light of ever-changing world conditions. Past successes and failures in the apportionment and disbursement of foreign aid must be evaluated in terms of changing Soviet tactics and the shifting world situation. Certainly, there is much historical evidence to demonstrate that independent commissions have very usefully served as a crucible for the blending, in proper measure, of reason, soundness and judgment with emotion, responsibility and objectivity while vaporizing the unreasonable, the unsound and the impractical.

THE HOUNDS AND THE HARE

(A weekly newsletter by Senator JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER)

WASHINGTON, June 18, 1956.—Ancient history records the tale of Mithridates IV, King of Pontus and Bithynia (about 63 B. C.), who concocted a confection, composed of 72 ingredients, which he claimed gave him special immunity. Now, it would seem that Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia, has hit upon a similar formula though the ingredients are considerably different and more in numbers. The principal ingredient would seem to be a curious blending of American dollars with the Communist teachings of Karl Marx.

Just 1 year ago, the minstrels of the Kremlin, who wander with a purpose, journeyed to Yugoslavia. By way of a return engagement, only recently, Marshal Tito, with much pomp and ceremony, made a pilgrimage to Moscow. Simultaneously, on both occasions, this Government was being importuned to send more economic and more foreign assistance to Yugoslavia.

It is interesting to note that, since the end of World War II, the community of free nations has furnished Yugoslavia nearly \$2.5 billion in aid. Of this amount, the United States supplied an estimated \$2 billion. In the sense that Tito has added more ingredients to his Mithridates, he has also obtained financial help from Communist bloc nations totaling about \$464 million equivalent.

Singly, and together, these events are fully consistent with the duplicity which has sparked the spread of world communism. The plan of operation never changes. Such a double and deceitful game was once de-

scribed as "to hold with the hare and run with the hounds"—or to run with the hounds as if to catch the hare, all the while being the secret friend of the hare. Those among us who have any doubts as to Marshal Tito's real motives might ponder the meaning of this old adage.

These two meetings have served to strengthen the Belgrade-Moscow axis—there can be little mistake about this. These two partners have again demonstrated a solidness of mutual interests—interests which fit the pattern of the international Communist conspiracy—interests which are contrary to those of the free world. Support of this point of view can certainly be found in the coming gathering of Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru of India, and Nasser of Egypt, all of which has been carefully cultivated in advance by the foreign minister of Soviet Russia.

The need for a reappraisal of our policy with all of these countries is now more pressing than ever.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. First, I may say to the Senator from California, the minority leader, that I am heartily in favor of his amendment and expect to vote for it.

I call the attention of the Senator to page 5, line 13, of the amendment. I refer to the third subject which the Commission is asked to study. I read as follows:

(g) The Commission shall conduct a comprehensive study and investigation of the operation of the present and past foreign aid programs of the United States, in order to provide complete information concerning—

(3) The need and willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

My suggestion is that the word "need" be stricken out, so that the paragraph would read:

The willingness of foreign countries to receive aid, and their capacity to make effective use thereof.

If a commission is to be asked, in a period of 4 or 5 months, to study the need of foreign countries to receive aid, it seems to me we shall be running into two problems. First, some countries may say they need a lot of military assistance; others may say they need a lot of economic assistance. The Commission would not have the opportunity or the ability to study and consider all those needs.

Second, it seems to me we might run into the question of, I will not say insulting a foreign country on what their needs were, if the Commission intended to be very frank, but it might be disquieting or undiplomatic, with all the embarrassment that goes with such action.

It seems to me the objective could be accomplished by ascertaining, first, what countries were willing to receive aid, and

then to have the Commission determine the capacity of those countries to use the aid.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Frankly, the word "need" was included in the amendment for a purpose. I have sat on the Committee on Appropriations with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, [Mr. ELLENDER] and have discussed with him, both privately and publicly, certain aspects of the mutual-aid program. He has had—and I thought with some justification—objections to certain phases of the program on the ground that many countries have rehabilitated themselves economically and no longer need aid, although they might be willing to accept it.

Under the circumstances, it seems to me that we almost are obliged to include the question of need, because I think it is pertinent for us to know if a foreign country is economically rehabilitated, if it can take care of its own problems, whether it be in the collective security system or elsewhere. If it is able to take care of itself, I do not think the United States should assume all the burden, for instance, of that country's defense efforts. I feel certain the Senator from Massachusetts likewise, does not believe we should.

So while I understand the Senator's point, I should be somewhat reluctant to remove the word "need," because to do so would seem to establish a legislative history that the aid to be given would be based on the willingness to receive it; and my observation is that most foreign countries are willing to receive aid.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I understand the Senator's point. I think there should be some qualifying phrase, possibly as to the extent to which the Commission should go into the details, or the thoroughness with which they should consider the matter.

I should think the words "overall need" might be used. That would make it a general conclusion, without the commission's having to determine whether a country needed a steel plant, or without having to determine the feasibility of building a dam, or without having to determine any questions of that nature which might arise.

Mr. KNOWLAND. It seems to me that the overall authority of the Commission would be sufficient to meet that problem. Obviously, the Commission could not make the physical examination; but they would have facts and figures presented to them, and could take judicial notice, so to speak, of certain requirements. They could then determine whether a country was on its feet and was able to carry its own burden. For instance, I should think the question of a country's national debt as compared with our own should be considered, and also whether the country was collecting taxes from its people in the way in which the United States collects taxes from its citizens.

There are many factors the Commission could consider without going into the last detail, which obviously no commission could do in the limited time provided, because if any commission is to be of value, it should report in time for the next Congress to take some action. The amendment provides that the report

shall be made early in the next session—by February 15 of next year.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Would the Senator be willing to add, after the word "need", language which might read "the need, in the time available to the Commission," or something of that character?

Possibly this discussion will help, but what I had in mind was language which would enable a commission to satisfy itself that it could make a report by February 15. I agree with the Senator that a report would be of no value unless it were made soon; but, at the same time, I had in mind that the members of the Commission should not be under the impression that they could not determine the question because they did not have time. I am merely suggesting language such as, "the need so far as the Commission can determine in the time available."

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to consider the suggestion, if the Senator will work out an amendment. I do not know that they would precisely do it. I see what the point of the Senator is. I am willing to hold a further discussion with him.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. LANGER. Who is in control of the time on the other side?

Mr. KNOWLAND. If I may answer the inquiry, the Senator in control of time on the other side is the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I am unalterably opposed to the amendment—

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from North Dakota will have time to speak in opposition. I ask the Senator not to speak on my time. The opposition, I am sure, will give him time to speak.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. BUTLER. Is it implicit in the language of the amendment, on page 5, line 22, that the Commission will cease to exist after it makes its report on or before February 15, 1957?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes; I think the Commission would cease, unless Congress itself took action to continue it.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the Senator consider that to be desirable? Would it not be better to have the Commission remain in existence for some further time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I would not want to see a permanent commission established. I believe it will work, but if Congress should find it does not work suitably, the Congress would have a chance to continue or enlarge the Commission or change the formula. I think what we want to do is get the basic information which we need before any other proposed legislation is presented to the Congress.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I shall support the amendment of the Senator from California. I think it is a most practical approach to the problem, and that it will provide answers to the questions of many Senators who want to be helpful and do everything possible for the defense of the country, but who have misgivings as to the way in which aid should be continued. I think this is a step in the right direction. I certainly hope the Senate will adopt the amendment.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 15 minutes to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a year ago tomorrow a very fateful event occurred. On that day, in the last 5 hours of the last day of the last fiscal year, the Defense Establishment reserved \$674 million. In the period from June 28 to June 30, it reserved over \$1 billion.

In the Kingdom of Laos at the present time, under this aid program, our Government is paying up to \$800 a year in family allowances to the families of the soldiers of the Laotian Army.

I think it is about time that the Senate undertook the assumption of its responsibility, without regard to the executive department, and looked into this program to find out just where the waste and mismanagement are.

After all, we are being asked for a huge sum of money once again. Are we going to shirk our responsibility and vote for a Hoover-type commission which will give the executive the opportunity to do with it what it sees fit? Does the Senate want a whitewash of the investigation of the foreign-aid administration, or does the Senate want to get up on its hind legs and take unto itself the responsibility which is ours under the Constitution of the United States?

Mr. President, the amendment proposed by the Senator from California would set up a Hoover-type commission to study the foreign-aid program—and, believe me, the foreign-aid program needs a thorough-going study.

The Commission proposed would include 4 Presidential nominees, 4 Senate nominees and 4 House nominees. Put in another way, of the total membership of 12, 8 would be appointed by the President and the Vice President, and 4 would be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The President would name the chairman.

I must oppose this amendment, Mr. President, because it flies in the face of action by the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House and by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, both of which considered similar proposals and rejected them. But more important, this amendment if adopted would constitute a fundamental surrender of the congressional investigative power to the executive.

I am unalterably opposed to turning a study of the foreign-aid program to the executive, to any executive-dominated group, or to any joint executive-public-congressional group. I have no confidence that recommendations from such groups would be objective or effective. We have had experience in the

past. In those instances in which Hoover-type commissions have made recommendations with which the executive has agreed, the executive acts. In those cases in which the executive has not agreed with recommendations, it has done nothing.

I recall a few years ago when Mr. Stassen took over the FOA. With great fanfare he appointed a commission of objective businessmen—the Francis Committee, I believe it was called. That group went over the FOA from top to bottom. It submitted recommendations that the FOA should be in the Department of State, that aid should be in the form of loans, and numerous other recommendations. But was anything done? No, not a single thing was done to carry out the recommendations of this group of objective businessmen, who were, by and large, Republican, so far as their politics were concerned.

This year the House Foreign Affairs Committee rejected an executive branch proposal that it investigate itself. The Committee on Foreign Relations likewise rejected that proposal for self-analysis.

The Executive has pulled all the stops in support of a great study of foreign aid. Just now we have had read to us, by the distinguished minority leader [Mr. KNOWLAND], a letter from the Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, saying he would approve of a combined executive-congressional type of investigation.

But what kind of study is wanted?

First, the executive wanted a study of the executive, by the executive and for the executive. But now that the bureaucracy has found that Congress will not give the President authority to do what he already can do—that is, inspect his own administrators—we are presented with a proposal for a Hoover-type commission, with two-thirds of the membership to be selected by the President and the Vice President.

What kind of an arrangement is this? I will have no part of it, and I do not think this Congress will have any part of it.

We have had experience in the past, and have seen recommendations of dependent groups conformed to the desires of the bureaucracy. We have seen past recommendations of independent groups ignored. We have seen our own proposals embodied in legislation shuttled off to the side and ignored.

Any proposal for a study that would be guided by the tender hands of the people who have been engaged for years in the foreign-aid program would only result in a beautiful whitewash.

We have no alternative, Mr. President. There is now pending before the Committee on Rules and Administration a resolution which embodies the original proposal of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE]. That resolution, Senate Resolution 285, calls upon the Committee on Foreign Relations to undertake exhaustive studies of the extent to which "foreign assistance by the United States Government serves, can be made to serve, or does not serve the national interest, to the end that such studies and recommendations based thereon may be available to

the Senate in considering foreign-aid policies for the future."

That resolution is based upon a proposal which the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations first put forth in early April, and which he made available to the press on April 18, 1956.

By way of brief background, the record should show that shortly after the senior Senator from Georgia first offered his suggestion, the Secretary of State and the President endorsed the idea in general terms. In specific terms, however, the executive branch began talking of a Presidential commission, instead of a Senate committee, to undertake the broad review suggested.

The original proposal embodied in Senate Resolution 285 made it clear that the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting for the Senate, was to undertake the study, making use of such independent, outside sources of information as it might find necessary. That proposal is clear on the fundamental point that the results of the study and the recommendations to be submitted to the Senate must be those of the Committee on Foreign Relations. It cannot delegate its responsibility to the Senate to anyone—any more than the Senate can delegate its responsibility for the examination of this program to the President or to a Hoover-type commission.

On the same day that the committee favorably reported the Mutual Security Act to the Senate, it favorably reported Senate Resolution 285, authorizing the George study. The committee took that action with only one dissenting vote, because it deeply felt the need for a careful, objective, nonpartisan examination of the program.

Despite that action of the Committee on Foreign Relations—followed some 2 days later by the action of the House committee in undertaking a similar, but independent, study—it now appears that there is afoot a coordinated move on the part of the bureaucracy to prevent the adoption of this resolution, and to substitute therefor a study which will be under executive branch control. As a matter of fact, all we need to do is adopt the Knowland amendment; and if it turns out that the House does not like this approach, the whole idea of an independent examination of foreign aid can be scuttled in conference.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Of course, the last statement the Senator from Montana has made simply is, I submit respectfully to the Senator from Montana, not in keeping with the facts, because there is ample power, under the rules of the Senate, under the La Follette-Monroney Act, for the Appropriations Committee, with its investigative powers, or for the Committee on Foreign Relations, or for the Committee on Armed Services; and certainly there could be no scuttling of any investigation which the Congress might order, regardless of whether this amendment should be accepted or rejected or whether the resolution referred to by the

Senator from Montana should be adopted or rejected.

But even though I serve as a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, I submit in connection with this matter, which is of concern to other Senators besides the 13 members of the Foreign Relations Committee, that the Appropriations Committee has as vital an interest, and I think perhaps the Armed Services Committee has as vital an interest, as does the Foreign Relations Committee. We could have 3 or 4 or 5 examinations going at the same time, plus an examination by the House of Representatives, plus an examination by the executive branch, and thus could obtain entirely different sets of facts, because each group would be looking at different segments of the picture, whereas in this case we shall get a coordinated picture.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What the Senator from California has said is true with respect to the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee. However, I certainly hope that the distinguished Senator from California, for whom I have the greatest respect and admiration, will not turn his back on the committee of which he is a distinguished member, and on which he has rendered outstanding service. I would expect him to be fighting in behalf of the resolution reported by that committee with only one dissenting vote, instead of pointing out the obvious fact that the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee, and perhaps other committees, can undertake investigations of their own.

I am requesting something that is fundamental, not only so far as a particular committee is concerned, but insofar as the Senate of the United States is concerned; and I, for one, do not intend to abdicate the responsibility I have as a Member of this body.

Mr. President, when the Committee on Rules and Administration met yesterday to consider Senate Resolution 285, it was impossible to obtain a quorum, because Members from across the aisle were absent. Incidentally, Mr. President, in the committee there were sufficient votes in favor of reporting favorably Senate Resolution 285; but in the interest of bipartisanship and senatorial responsibility, the committee took no action at that time.

If the administration had shown as much initiative in responding to the new Soviet strategy as it has shown in reacting to the proposed independent study of the foreign aid, there would be no need for the Senate to take on this job.

In view of the early friendly reaction of the administration to the George proposal, I have been surprised by the recent activities of the bureaucracy. I have been reminded of the restaurant with the sign in the window stating that the kitchen is open for inspection. But when someone tries to inspect the kitchen, he finds all the doors locked. That always makes me suspicious.

When the committee reported Senate Resolution 285, it considered various alternatives.

It rejected the idea of a joint Senate-House committee, because this fall Members of the House will be occupied with

the elections, and because of the problems in getting such a committee under way in an expeditious manner. Furthermore, the other House is free to conduct its own study, as it did in the case of the Herter committee, prior to the Marshall plan, and as it is doing now, on the basis of its own initiative, vis-a-vis the foreign-aid program.

The Committee on Foreign Relations also rejected the idea of a Hoover-type commission because that would involve a big staff and would take a long time in organization. It is doubtful if such a study could be under way, much less completed, by next February. I may add that it is my personal view that the reports of the last Hoover Commission did not elicit widespread support simply because the Commission was packed by too many men whose personal predilections got in the way of the objectivity needed if such a group is to be of influence. If there is anything the foreign-aid program needs it is an objective analysis.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield 5 additional minutes to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 5 additional minutes to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Although serious consideration was given to expanding the proposed committee to include members from other Senate committees, as has been done in some past instances, it was felt that this particular job was primarily one for the Committee on Foreign Relations. Furthermore it was the clear intent of the Legislative Reorganization Act to limit the number of special committees that might be created and to give the standing committees authority broad enough to enable them to carry on studies of this kind.

Finally, Mr. President, underlying the decision of the committee was full awareness that it is a constitutional function of the Congress to exercise a constant control over the executive. Unless we discharge that responsibility efficiently and fully, we are not doing our job.

The chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations remarked yesterday that "the questions of our citizens about the foreign-aid program must be well and fully answered before this body is again asked to authorize the appropriation of funds for mutual security." It is the purpose of Senate Resolution 285 to help our citizens answer their many questions about foreign aid. I do not think the American people will accept answers from the very bureaucracy which has administered foreign aid, or from appointees of that bureaucracy.

Mr. President, while I have indicated my concern at the backstage maneuvers that have been going on in connection with the proposed study, I want to state emphatically that I think it would be a most serious mistake if this study were launched in a partisan atmosphere.

If the amendment now before us is defeated and the resolution reported favorably by the Committee on Foreign Relations is adopted after Rules Committee action, I know that the study will be conducted in a nonpartisan manner. I would for my part, for example, urge that the committee take no decisions without broad bipartisan support. I would urge it not to make public the results of any studies until after the election. The subject matter of this amendment and of the proposed resolution is too important for the security of this Nation to be viewed in a partisan light.

Although the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations will not be with us when the final recommendations are submitted, I know that for the next critical 6 months he will be in full and active charge of the study proposed by Senate Resolution 285. There is no finer leadership under which to start this long-needed evaluation of the mutual-security programs. No one need fear that the senior Senator from Georgia would lend himself to a partisan approach to the problem or that he would be other than scrupulously fair in getting this much needed job under way. As chairman of this committee the great Senator from Georgia will add to the many brilliant accomplishments which have already marked his outstanding senatorial career.

I hope we will not shirk our constitutional responsibilities to the American people and that this amendment will be rejected so that we can in due course undertake a proper Senate investigation of foreign aid, and thereby assume our full and complete responsibility.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With regard to the point which the able minority leader made, that there is a broad interest in this bill, does the Senator think that there is any broader interest in this bill than there is in the defense appropriation bill, or in the development of our natural resources?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. The Senator from Arkansas is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is always that broad interest. However, the traditions of the Senate call for the delegation of specific inquiries to specific committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct; and in this instance the specific committee which has legislative authority is the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If something is to be done about the problem next year, that is the committee to do it. It would not be a special committee.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is stating the fact.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If a special Hoover-type commission were created, it could not actually put anything into effect. It could only recommend.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Montana has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield another minute to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is again correct. I believe that any investigation committee which involved outside members would be more or less directed by the Executive, and that very likely in the end the result would be a whitewash. Mr. President, the American people will not be satisfied with a whitewash investigation of the foreign-aid program.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will not be, either. I should like to associate myself with the Senator's remarks.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I completely endorse the remarks of my distinguished colleague from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], who is a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. The Senate has no higher duty, under our legislative system, than to deal with the policies and subjects with which a standing committee of that jurisdiction is properly charged.

The Senate also has the highest possible duty to the Nation, as the prime mover, the prime originator of investigations of the conduct of our foreign policy. To turn that duty over to an executive department which has shown little interest in learning how the program is being administered, how much waste is occurring in the program, or what completely opposite directions our foreign-aid program is taking, when we are faced with a new type of cold war, is not sufficient.

I believe that the situation indicates the wisdom of the plea of the distinguished Senator from Montana for legislative surveillance in this field. To do less would be to abdicate the duty of the Foreign Relations Committee. As one who has consistently supported foreign aid, from the time I was a member of the Herter committee, I am disappointed to find the foreign-aid program so musclebound, and so encumbered with retreaded ideas that it cannot possibly meet the new cold war problem which now is facing us.

The only alternative to misdirection of aid or overemphasis on military aid is to vote for deep and heavy cuts to try to bring about in some way an agonizing reappraisal of the policies which, to those of us who have followed the foreign-aid program, appear to be obsolete and useless. Many of the strongest supporters of foreign aid in the past feel this same way.

Uncle Sam is acting like a man who does not count his change. We act like a football team, coached to defend against a ground attack, for which we might have been prepared during the days of the mailed-fist policy of the Communists. But now the Communists have resorted to a change in tactics in their desire for world domination. They are now using a forward passing and an aerial attack but the coach does not change the defense of the football team to meet this new threat.

It seems to me that to try to offer munitions around the world, to the tune of \$3,400,000,000 as proposed in this bill, or \$4 billion, as recommended by the State Department, is as obsolete and old-

fashioned in today's cold war as trying to sell buggy whips in Detroit.

People are interested in ideas and ideals. All the State Department offers, under its present policy, is dollars and more dollars. It seems to me that a study by the Foreign Relations Committee, which has a firm understanding of the background, and is desirous of giving us a modern, aggressive, effective foreign-aid policy and foreign-aid program, would be far better than an investigation by a few executives from big business, who would be brought here to take the advice of the foreign-aid administrators and conclude that everything is fine and dandy, and that, although we are losing the cold war on every front, we should do more and more of what has been done during past years.

Mr. President, I intend to support, to the limit of my ability, the reappraisal contemplated by the resolution to which reference has been made.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. I certainly agree with him, a coauthor of the Monroney-La Follette Reorganization Act, in putting his finger on the fact that the responsibility lies with the Committee on Foreign Relations, acting as the agent of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I should like to ask a question of the Senator from Montana. Is it not true that the minds of the Executive and his assistants are already made up? In fact, they came before the Committee on Foreign Relations and asked for a 10-year extension on some features of foreign aid. If it had not been for the stamina and statesmanship of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] they might have succeeded in that respect. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I may say to my good friend from North Dakota the question is why all of a sudden there should be this intense interest in looking into the foreign-aid program, which is being developed by the executive department at this late date. Why is it only after the idea was originally advanced by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations? The big question is, Why?

Mr. LANGER. Did not the executive want a 10-year extension, only a short time ago?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; indeed. Mr. LANGER. And if it had not been for the Senator from Georgia, they would have succeeded in getting it. Is that correct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I know of some individuals who have suggested a program as long as 75 years. I will give the Senator the names, if he wishes me to do so.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I do not wish to obstruct any other agency in making its own investigation. However, I do not believe that such an investigation should be in substitution for an investigation to be made by the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee should make its own study. Personally I would not be satisfied with the recommendations of an outside committee on a matter of this kind.

The Foreign Relations Committee has the special responsibility in this field. Granted that every Member of the Senate has an interest in it, just as he does in all major legislation; but under our traditions and under our rules, the primary responsibility is in the Committee on Foreign Relations. It is up to the committee to make an intelligent judgment of the need and it is that committee's responsibility to make the study.

Personally I have been very doubtful, and I am still very critical, of some of the purposes to which this money will be devoted. One of the things which has reconciled me in voting to report the bill and in my intention to vote for it on the floor of the Senate is the resolution of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I have said to myself, "I can go along for one more year if we are sure to have an investigation and a careful study and a full reevaluation of the purposes." If, after that study is made, the same purposes are apparent in the bill which comes before the Senate next year, I will conclude that I was wrong in my criticism of the bill.

I still believe that the bill is too heavily weighted for the military and too little devoted, relatively, to the economic development of underdeveloped countries. I believe in that sense it will be a waste of money. I believe we are paying too much attention to the military aspect in countries like Turkey, for example. Some very restrictive and regressive and reactionary developments have taken place in Turkey. Yesterday Turkey took a further step toward muzzling freedom of speech and muzzling the opposition in its young democratic parliament. I consider that a very backward step. That is an example, in my view, of an unbalanced policy in that field. I very strongly hope that the Senate will not sidetrack the resolution supported by the committee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am greatly disturbed by the turn that this discussion has taken this afternoon. I was present in committee when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, made the original suggestion that a thorough study be made of this whole subject. We all agreed that there was need for such a study. I did not then know that there would be an issue created as to how the study was to be organized or who should conduct it.

I had the privilege to attend a conference in the White House, which was

also attended by the Senator from Georgia, and other Senators. At that time I understood there was no difference between the executive branch of the Government and the legislative branch in connection with the effort which was to be made to study our aid program.

Mr. President, it is most unfortunate that we should have reached this turn in the matter, and that the implication should be raised that the Executive would not make an honest study or investigation of the subject. I must protest any such insinuation.

Mr. President, I believe the Foreign Relations Committee has a perfect right to set up its own investigation. I also believe that the executive department has a perfect right to set up its own investigation. I had hoped that we could have some kind of arrangement which would provide for cooperation between them.

The whole idea was that we should try to get together and determine who could best make the investigation, whether it be the Brookings Institution, or some other outstanding group interested in foreign affairs. That is the spirit in which I understood the investigation would be made. I regret exceedingly that we have reached the point where a vote on the question will look like a political difference of opinion. I cannot very well vote against my party. However, I thought we had arranged the matter in the committee in such form as would recognize both the executive and the legislative branch of the Government.

To say that the Senate cannot trust the President of the United States to have a part in the investigation is certainly objectionable, and I cannot go along with any such suggestion. Therefore I shall be compelled to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. I shall do so because I must protest the suggestion that the President should be bypassed, or that we cannot trust his participation in such a study, and that therefore we should make an investigation independent of the Executive.

I believe the legislative and executive branches should be working together. We should not be getting into a row, so to speak, as to whether we will appoint a commission in which the Executive will participate, or whether an independent investigation should be made, where we would ignore the executive branch and, in effect, imply that the President would not make an honest investigation, or that anything done by the executive branch would be a whitewash. I am distressed by the whole thing.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not correct to say that the idea behind the resolution adopted by the Committee on Foreign Relations was that the committee would conduct this study, and that we fully expected the executive to conduct a separate but parallel study, as was done when the Marshall plan, for instance, was put into effect? There we had a congressional study made by the Herter Committee of the House of Represent-

atives, and the executive had its own, separate study made. The two were made to mesh, one with the other. It seemed to me that was done very well. I thought that was the reasoning behind the adoption of our resolution. I am sure the Senator from New Jersey will agree with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I believe that is true, but it appears to me the implications are now that we are adopting the resolution in order to keep the Executive out of the picture entirely. That is something I cannot go along with. Therefore I am compelled to vote for the Knowland amendment, because that issue has been forced on us in the presentation of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Will the Senator from California yield me 1 minute?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I am unable to do so. I have only 2 minutes remaining. Mr. President, I started my remarks by pointing out that there was certainly room for an honest difference of opinion as to how we should proceed to make a proper investigation. I have the highest confidence in the Senate. When I have found it necessary to be critical of the Executive, whether a Democrat or a Republican, I have never hesitated to discharge my responsibility as a Senator.

I have been shocked and surprised at the assertion that the Executive could not be depended upon to make a proper investigation, but I do not think the Executive should make the investigation alone. I believe that Congress has a coequal responsibility in that regard. It could happen that there would be 5 or 6 or 7 congressional reports, followed by a report from the Executive, and thus we would wind up without any constructive accomplishment in the long run.

We should all be interested in this matter. No man knows whether the next administration will be a Republican administration, which I hope it will be, or an administration dominated by the other party, which Members on the other side of the aisle hope it will be. We have a common responsibility as Americans, and I think the approach should be to have the Congress and the executive working together. There will be a bipartisan control. The procedure as to appointments to committees which has been followed heretofore I am sure would be followed in this instance, on recommendation of the majority leader and the minority leader, and I think the House would follow the same general procedure.

I would hope that under those circumstances the Commission could make a report which would be impressive both to the executive and to the legislative arm of the Government. For that reason, Mr. President, I ask that the amendment be adopted.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield 1 minute on the bill, so that I may add a few words?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I should like to add, at the end of subsection (g) (3), in line 15 on page 5 of the amendment, the following: "by such inquiries and reports as it can obtain in the time permitted before its report is to be submitted."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I accept that amendment and I modify my amendment accordingly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from California is so modified.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California as modified.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND], as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Washington would vote "nay" and the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea."

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea."

I further announce that if present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin

[Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Texas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea" and the Senator from Georgia would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 41, nays 45, as follows:

YEAS—41

Alken	Dirksen	Mundt
Allott	Duff	Payne
Barrett	Dworshak	Potter
Beall	Flanders	Purtell
Bender	Goldwater	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Schoeppel
Bricker	Hruska	Smith, Maine
Bridges	Ives	Smith, N. J.
Bush	Knowland	Thye
Butler	Kuchel	Watkins
Case, N. J.	Malone	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Martin, Pa.	Williams
Cotton	McCarthy	Young
Curtis	Millikin	

NAYS—45

Anderson	Hill	McClellan
Bible	Holland	McNamara
Byrd	Humphrey,	Monroney
Chavez	Minn.	Morse
Clements	Humphreys,	Murray
Douglas	Ky.	Neuberger
Eastland	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Ellender	Johnson, Tex.	Pastore
Ervin	Johnston, S. C.	Robertson
Frear	Kefauver	Scott
Fulbright	Kennedy	Smathers
George	Kerr	Sparkman
Gore	Langer	Stennis
Green	Lehman	Symington
Hayden	Long	Wofford
Hennings	Mansfield	

NOT VOTING—10

Capehart	LaIRD	Russell
Carlson	Magnuson	Wiley
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	
Jenner	Neely	

So Mr. KNOWLAND's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I submit an amendment which I ask to have lie on the table. I shall call it up later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and will lie on the table.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-27-56—C."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois desire that his amendment be read in full, or that it be printed in the Record?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment proposed by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. DUFF, and Mr. LEHMAN) to the committee amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. —. (a) It is the declared policy of the Congress to resist the spread of communism. The issue between the free and the slave world is essentially whether freedom shall survive. The struggle to preserve freedom, however, is not to be won solely by further resistance to enslavement, but also by keeping alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. It is the purpose of this section to advance the cause of freedom by providing aid and support to those groups which are actively engaged in maintaining, inspiring, and instilling that spirit and hope.

"(b) (1) There is hereby created an agency under the name 'Freedom Administration' (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administration'), which shall be under the general direction and supervision of the President and shall not be affiliated with or be a part of any other agency or department of the Federal Government. The principal office of the Administration shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Administration may establish offices in such other places as may be determined by the Administrator of the Administration.

"(2) The management of the Administration shall be vested in an Administrator (hereinafter referred to as the 'Administrator') who shall be appointed from civilian life by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Administrator shall receive compensation at the rate of \$17,500 per annum. There shall also be appointed to the Administration, by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, 8 Deputy Administrators who shall each be paid at the rate of \$15,000 per annum. The deputy administrators shall be outstanding citizens of the United States, 1 of whom shall be of German descent, 1 of Polish descent, 1 of Lithuanian descent, 1 of Latvian descent, 1 of Estonian descent, 1 of Czech descent, 1 of Ukrainian descent, and 1 of such descent as to represent the remaining Slavic peoples in the Communist world.

"(c) The Administration shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a seal which shall be judicially noticed. The Administrator is authorized, subject to the civil-service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, to select, employ, appoint, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this section. The Administration, with the consent of any department or agency of the Government, may avail itself on a reimbursable basis of the services, facilities, and personnel of any such department or agency.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out its functions under this section, the Administration—

"(1) may sue and be sued;

"(2) may adopt, amend, and repeal rules and regulations governing the manner in which its business may be conducted and its powers exercised;

"(3) may make and carry out such contracts and other arrangements as are necessary or advisable in carrying out its functions;

"(4) may determine the character of and the necessity for its obligations and expenditures, and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid subject to the provisions of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended; and

"(5) take such other action as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section.

"(e) (1) The Administrator is authorized to make grants to any private or semiprivate nonprofit organization, committee, or group which is actively engaged in broadcasting, publishing, correspondence, or other activities designed to keep alive the spirit and hope of freedom, and the will to resist enslavement, in persons residing in Communist or Communist-dominated countries.

"(2) In making any grant under this section the Administrator shall advise and consult with the Director of Central Intelligence, and no such grant shall be made except with the concurrence of a majority of the deputy administrators of the Administration.

"(f) (1) There shall be established in the Treasury Department a special fund which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the operation and expenses of the Administration. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund for each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1957, the sum of \$20 million.

"(2) Notwithstanding section 1415 of the supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953, or any other provision of law, foreign currencies or credits owed to or owned by the United States shall, with the approval of the President, be made available to the Administration for the purpose of making any grant authorized by this section.

"(g) The Administrator shall submit to the President for transmission to the Congress at the beginning of each regular session an annual report of its operations under this section.

"(h) Section 101 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U. S. C. 846), is amended by inserting after 'St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation;' the words 'Freedom Administration.'"

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], and myself, I offer this amendment establishing a Freedom Administration.

We propose that \$20 million, an amount equal to about one-half of 1 percent of the foreign aid funds, be added to this appropriation authorization for the purpose of keeping freedom alive in the now-subjugated countries and peoples behind the Iron Curtain. In particular, I refer to countries held captive by Russia; namely, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania. In addition, Mr. President, I am proposing that the Congress recommend—and authorize where necessary—the use of certain counterpart funds, and also funds credited to the United States by foreign countries under section 550 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951 and section 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, for the same purpose.

These funds, Mr. President, would be used to create and establish an independent agency of the Government, directly under the President, to be called a Freedom Administration. This Freedom Administration would allocate the funds provided to approved national freedom committees for the following purposes, among others:

First. To maintain and expand broadcasting activities to the enslaved peoples of Iron Curtain countries.

Second. To expand existing programs of correspondence to subjugated peoples for the purpose of keeping alive the spirit of freedom and resistance.

Third. To aid other programs by national groups, such as the printing and distribution of pamphlets and information, to keep freedom and hope alive in the enslaved nations.

Fourth. To finance programs to encourage and aid those who, at the risk of life itself, flee or have fled to the free world from the Communist world, and to offset the Communist drive to get these refugees to return to their original countries.

Fifth. To give monetary support to resistance groups which aim at eventual independence of now-satellite nations.

I think I should make it clear that it is not the intention of the amendment to incite armed revolt at an inopportune time behind the Iron Curtain, but to keep alive the spirit of resistance and stimulate effective slow-downs, which would have the effect of weakening the economic control of those countries. Of course, if we can help armed uprisings, we should not shrink from it.

Sixth. To publicize the names of those former democratic leaders of the Iron Curtain countries who still remain in jail or work camps, so that the world may know their fate and their struggle.

Seventh. To assist in promoting and maintaining other programs which aim at the eventual freedom of enslaved peoples. And I may say in this respect, that by providing adequate assistance to an agency and a staff of competent people, many other effective methods and ways may be found to further this cause.

Now, Mr. President, let me be more specific; first, about the Freedom Administration which I am proposing, and, second, about how it can be financed.

My amendment would create a Freedom Administration, an independent agency with an administrator who is an American citizen and directly responsible to the President of the United States.

In addition, my amendment provides for 8 assistant administrators, 1 of whom would be an outstanding German-American, 1 a Polish-American, 1 a Lithuanian-American, 1 a Latvian-American, 1 an Estonian-American, 1 a Czech-American, 1 of Ukrainian descent, and 1 American chosen to represent the Slavic peoples and other enslaved ethnic groups now behind the Iron Curtain.

The Administrator would be paid \$17,500 per year and each Assistant Administrator, \$15,000, or a total of \$137,500.

The Administration, with the approval of any four of the Assistant Administrators, could use the funds appropriated for various purposes and specific projects among which are those which I have already mentioned and outlined.

Obviously, the President of the United States would have the final say-so on how and where the funds were to be used. My amendment would allow the Administrator to coordinate his programs with the Central Intelligence Agency. My amendment does not put the agency under the State Department for a number of valid reasons which I shall discuss later, but there is no reason

why the President who, after all, is responsible for our foreign policy, could not consult with his Secretary of State on policy questions.

In addition to \$20 million of the foreign-aid appropriation, the Freedom Administration could draw upon counterpart funds now on deposit in Europe to the credit of the United States, with the approval of the President, for allocation to approved national freedom committees now or hereafter functioning in the free world, to enable these committees to maintain and to step up their broadcasting, publishing, correspondence, and other campaigns to keep alive freedom and resistance behind the Iron Curtain. Committees to which counterpart funds are allocated shall have the approval of a majority of the Assistant Administrators.

As the Senate knows, in Europe and in Greece and Turkey at this time, 10 percent of the counterpart funds deposited to match dollar funds obligated in the country are reserved for United States use. This has been true since June 20, 1952, and before that time there was a 5-percent requirement. In the fiscal year 1955, the amount of funds of European countries transferred to United States use amounted to \$31.9 million, and from April 3, 1948, to June 30, 1955, the cumulative amounts so deposited amounted to \$610.6 million. Here, Mr. President, is a source of funds available for United States use which has already been appropriated by the Congress and which certainly can be and ought to be used in part for the purposes I have outlined here.

In addition, funds are made available for United States use under sections 550 of the act of 1951 and 402 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954. These are funds made available to the United States in the currency of the local country from the sale of United States surplus agricultural commodities. On June 30, 1955, the amount of the balance on deposit for Europe alone was \$80,882,000. These funds, of course, are used for a variety of purposes, including direct forces support, defense support, and development assistance programs. Yet, there is no reason why a fair share of these funds could not be used for the purposes of establishing a Freedom Administration Agency.

Thus, Mr. President, it is possible to establish and carry out a Freedom Administration program to keep alive the spirit of freedom of the now subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. The program can be carried out largely with funds which the Congress has already appropriated or which Congress will appropriate in the future for our mutual-security needs.

The program is badly needed. Too many people are being lulled into a sense of well-being and forgetfulness because of what I believe is only an apparent shift in Soviet policy. There is increasing talk in high circles in this country about co-existence and this can lead to dangerous concessions which will be in fact, although not in name, acts of appeasement. We must not forget those of our fellow men who still struggle against the chains of Communist slavery. We have pledged

ourselves as a matter of national policy to do all we can to keep their hope and spirit alive and to help them achieve their freedom and dignity as free men which all men everywhere deserve as a right. I hope, Mr. President, that the Senate will approve of my proposal.

My amendment, Mr. President, is in no way designed to do away with certain functions which are already authorized by the Congress. I refer specifically to the program of the United States Information Agency and the United States escapee program and other programs designed to keep the spirit of freedom alive in the conquered countries.

But, Mr. President, the program I propose would extend that program and would use the talents and abilities of groups which are active in the fight for freedom but whose services are not now being used to any great extent.

There are numerous nationality groups—in the United States as well as in Europe—who are working day and night to aid their countrymen who are now in chains. For the most part, these groups have little money and their activities are limited by the small amount of private funds which are available to them. It is true that we are providing \$7 million in the present appropriation for the escapee program, which my amendment would aid and abet. It is also true that, under section 401 of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, the President has a special fund which he may use for certain specific programs; \$100 million may be used for any selected persons who are residing in, or are escapees from, the Soviet Union and the conquered satellites. I wish to stress those words, "selected persons," for the amendment I propose would go beyond selected persons to nationality groups who are already organized and who are fighting by peaceful means to gain freedom for their countrymen. Further, the purposes for which the funds under section 401 can be used by the President have been limited. He can use them—and I quote from the language of Public Law 665 "either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area or to the security of the United States."

Mr. President, those are worthy purposes. I agree with them. But, Mr. President, the money has not been spent—to my knowledge—in any great amount to use the services of the many nationality groups who are fighting the Communists. The President's fund is a program aimed at persons and it is a program aimed primarily at bringing these persons into the North Atlantic Treaty military organization. Therefore, the amendment I offer in no way conflicts with section 401, the President's special fund, and, in fact, would harness the abilities and knowledge of groups of free men on this side of the Iron Curtain to help speed the day when their own former countries would be free and independent. My amendment would establish a program which is not now in

effect and would tap the abilities and resources of peoples and groups whose abilities are not now being used on anything like the scale they should be used. That, Mr. President, is the purpose of my amendment and it is a purpose which is both a worthy one and one which is not now being put into effect.

A word or two of history about this amendment and about an alternative amendment which was offered and adopted earlier this afternoon may be in order. The amendment which is now being offered was first offered by me to the Foreign Relations Committee during its deliberations, in substantially the same form in which it is now offered. At the same time, my colleague, the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], proposed an alternative amendment, having some, though not all, of the same aims, but differing from our amendment in at least two major respects:

First, instead of some \$20 million provided under my amendment, plus the use of counterpart and other funds available to the United States in foreign countries, his amendment provided \$5 million, and that to be spent at the discretion of the President.

Second, whereas I proposed a separate administration based on nationality groups in this country, he proposed that it be administered under the direction of the President.

Both of those proposals were considered by the Foreign Relations Committee, and both were rejected. The State Department sent to the committee a letter, which I shall discuss later in my speech, describing its reasons for opposing my amendment.

I determined to bring this matter up on the floor, and therefore had my amendment printed and presented to a number of Members of the Senate. I gave notice to the leadership that I intended to raise the question, as a matter of public record, and that I was going to bring up the issue. I talked it over at a luncheon for a number of Senators including the minority leader. I held nothing back and was frank about what I intended to do. My colleague did not have his amendment printed. There was no record of which I was aware that it was going to be offered, and I assumed, perhaps unwarily, that it would not be offered.

This afternoon, a little more than 2 hours ago, when very few Senators were on the floor, my colleague presented his amendment in typewritten form, with some penciled additions to it, and it was accepted and is now a part of the bill.

I regret that I was not notified by him that this alternative proposal to ours was to be submitted. My office was not notified, and I am told that the amendment went through when there were very few Senators present on the floor.

I hasten to say that I have notified my colleague that I intended to speak on this subject. His office was notified; and, just a few minutes ago, I notified him in person. So I feel I at least have observed the amenities of the Senate in giving full notice to my colleague of what I intended to do.

Incidentally, I think it may be worthy of notice that, whereas my amendment was brushed off with a letter from an Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Hill, the Secretary of State himself addressed a letter to my colleague approving his proposal. I am not an expert on protocol, but I sometimes wonder if under this administration they have established two classes of Senators here, first-class Senators and second-class Senators, second-class Senators being Democratic Senators whose proposals receive notice only from an Assistant Secretary of State, whereas Republican Senators get the red-carpet treatment and receive letters from the Secretary of State.

I rather think I am correct on such matters of gentlemanly etiquette, if not State Department protocol, and I respectfully call this fact to the attention of the cutaway-coat and striped-pants boys down in Foggy Bottom who are experts, so they think, in all matters of gentlemanly decorum.

Let me proceed to discuss the substantive merits of our proposal, and to contrast it with the proposal made by my colleague. In the first place, our amendment would give more money; specifically, it would set aside \$20 million, as contrasted to the \$5 million authorized under the amendment of my colleague. In addition, our amendment would permit counterpart funds and funds built up by the sale of agricultural commodities abroad among others, to be drawn on for the purposes of my amendment. So that our proposal calls for a much more adequately financed program than does that of my colleague.

Secondly, it should be noticed that the proposal of my colleague merely states that the money is to be spent at the discretion of the President. I have discussed the fact that Congress, on a previous occasion, by the adoption of the so-called Kersten amendment some time back, provided funds of \$100 million, to be spent at the discretion of the President, for some of these purposes, although they might be regarded as being limited merely to integrating refugees from behind the Iron Curtain countries into the Armed Forces of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

I have been trying to get the facts on how much has been spent under the Kersten program. The committee report seems to indicate, on page 50, that not more than \$12 million of the \$100 million appropriated last year has been spent; and I have heard reports that appreciably less than that has been spent. So I think it can be said that the administration has not taken advantage of the funds which already have been provided to it, and that if we can judge the future by the past—which is substantially the only way one can judge the future—the prospects do not look very good for much action under the amendment which was adopted when only a few Members were on the floor, and when not many Members knew what was going on.

A third difference is that my colleague's proposal would, of necessity, mean that the work would be carried on

under the direction of the State Department. We had certain very definite reasons for setting up a separate administration from the State Department to handle this matter. I shall try to discuss those reasons very frankly and in all charity. The members of the State Department have frequently been unjustly criticized and when this has been done, I have defended them. But a frank statement of their disqualifications is in order.

In the first place, it is very hard to get the State Department to try to sow discontent within any country with which it has diplomatic relationships. The members of the State Department are trained in the code of diplomacy—at least toward foreign countries, if not toward members of the opposition party within their own country; and they observe a proud punctilio in such matters, by saying that they should not sow discontent with one hand while they balance a teacup or a cocktail glass with the other. They are the teacup boys and the cocktail boys and the diplomatic note-writing boys; and do not like to have their attention diverted in other directions. They sometimes find it beneath their dignity to stir up discontent among the peoples of the governments with which they are dealing. This is not an indictment by me of the State Department; it is merely an indication that those in the State Department have certain occupational characteristics which they cannot overcome. Barbers are said to be loquacious; shoemakers' children are supposed to be ill shod; and members of the State Department do not like to engage in stirring up discontent in the countries to which they are assigned. In fact, members of the State Department feel that they are representatives to governments, not representatives to peoples; and I wish to say that they tend to regard their duties as being discharged when they present diplomatic notes and when they go through the formalities of communication. As a result, when someone like Mrs. Anderson or Mr. Bowles comes along—someone who wishes to be friendly with the people and to establish bonds of amity with them—the members of the State Department shake their collective heads, and their collars wilt, and their faces become longer and longer, and their temperature diminishes to such a point that fruit could be preserved for a long time in the low temperature which exudes from them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Would the Senator from Illinois be willing to strike out the word "collective" from his phrase "collective heads"?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Perhaps I should strike out the word "heads" and substitute "that organ of the body which gives to them tropismatic responses." [Laughter.] That is one point. We felt that there should be more vigorous administration than that, and that the administration should be handled by a new group.

Furthermore, with the passage of time, any governmental agency tends to be-

come somewhat waterlogged and unenthusiastic about new projects; and if we are to obtain results, it is frequently necessary to start a new administration. We found that to be true when we began the Marshall plan. The State Department wanted to administer it; but it is well known that if that had happened, the Marshall plan would not have been very effective. So a separate administration was established to handle the Marshall plan; that administration was under Mr. Paul Hoffman. Regardless of whether one approves of the principles of the Marshall plan—I think nearly everyone does now, although perhaps some may quarrel about the amounts spent—I think everyone will agree that under Mr. Hoffman, the Marshall plan was handled much more efficiently than it would have been if it had been handled by State Department personnel.

There is another point, and I shall be frank about it, namely, that while the Republican candidate for the presidency and his prospective Secretary of State campaigned vigorously on the program of liberation, in practice that program was not carried out, once the administration took office; and, instead, there has been substituted a program of co-existence and of getting along with the Russians, which tends to make the administration reluctant to embark upon a vigorous program of this type.

Mr. President, I wish to cite, if I may, the pledges which Mr. Dulles and General Eisenhower made in the campaign of 1952. I do this, not in a partisan sense, but in order that Members of the Senate may be apprised of the commitments the administration made when it sought the favor of the American people; and I do so in the hope that the President and the Secretary of State and the State Department may have second thoughts about the matter, and may return to their earlier position.

In an article in *Life Magazine* on May 19, 1952, Mr. John Foster Dulles wrote:

Consider the situation of the twenty-odd non-Western nations which are next door to the Soviet world. . . . Today they live close to despair because the United States, the historic leader of the forces of freedom seems dedicated to the negative policy of containment and stalemate.

But liberation from the yoke of Moscow will not occur for a very long time, and courage in neighboring lands will not be sustained, unless the United States makes it publicly known that it wants and expects liberation to occur.

Mr. President, if any Member doubts the accuracy of that quotation, I have before me a photostatic copy of the article which was published in *Life magazine*.

Mr. Dulles continued, as follows:

The mere statement of that wish and expectation would change, in an electrifying way, the mood of the captive peoples. It would put heavy new burdens on the jailers and create new opportunities for liberation. (*Life*, May 19, 1952, p. 154.)

In the Republican Party platform of 1952, there was this statement:

The policies we espouse will revive the contagious, liberating influences which are inherent in freedom. They will inevitably set up strains and stresses within the captive world which will make the rulers im-

potent to continue in their monstrous ways and mark the beginning of their end.

Mr. President, Members of the Senate will recall that the chairman of the committee who wrote this section of the Republican Party platform in 1952 was the present Secretary of State, Mr. John Foster Dulles.

Then we come to August 1952; and when speaking before the American Legion Convention, on August 25, 1952, Candidate Eisenhower had this to say:

We must tell the Kremlin that never shall we desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seek refuge with us, any man who keeps burning among his own people the flame of freedom or who is dedicated to the liberation of his fellows.

Mr. President, that quotation will be found in the *New York Times* for August 26, 1952, on page 12; and if any Member doubts the accuracy of that quotation, I have before me a photostatic copy of the article in the *New York Times*.

Our proposal would help to make it clear, in the words of General Eisenhower, that the United States "never shall desist in our aid to every man and woman of those shackled lands who seeks refuge with us."

Following this speech of General Eisenhower on August 25, he and Mr. Dulles conferred, and the results of the conference were made public in a news conference by Mr. Dulles on August 26, 1952. Mr. Dulles made the following statement, as quoted in the *New York Times* of August 27, 1952, pages 1 and 15:

General Eisenhower agreed with me again that the most important single issue before the American people is the issue of foreign policy.

What we should do is try to split the satellite states away from the control of a few men in Moscow, he urged. The only way to stop a head-on collision with the Soviet Union is to break it up from within.

Mr. Dulles said the United States should never accept a divided Korea, a divided Germany, or a divided Austria as a finality. Truce negotiations should be continued to end the fighting in Korea, he said, but they should not be used as an arrangement which divide Korea permanently.

And on August 27, 1952, in a speech before the American Political Science Association at Buffalo, N. Y., Mr. Dulles had this to say—and I quote from the *New York Times* of August 28, 1952, page 12:

Next, he said, resistance movements would spring up among patriots, who could be supplied and integrated via air drops and other communications from private organizations like the Committee for a free Europe.

Although there were many other specific pledges in the 1952 campaign, I wish to quote only two more by General Eisenhower. Speaking in Cincinnati on September 22, 1952, he made the following statement:

These principles demand that we use every political, every economic, every psychological tactic to see that the liberating spirit, in the nations conquered by communism, shall never perish. Thus, we shall help each captive nation to maintain an outward strain against its Moscow bond. The lands closed in behind the Iron Curtain will seethe with discontent; their people, not servants docile under a Soviet master, but ardent patriots yearning to be free again. Nothing is so

damaging to a tyrant's war machine as the steadfast spirit of an unhappy people.

And on September 27, 1952, Mr. Eisenhower made this pledge in a letter to the town meeting, Old Sturbridge, Mass., and I quote:

In the struggle against expanding communism, we must miss no opportunity to rally men and women everywhere to the cause of freedom and progress, as opposed to the reaction of totalitarian policies and methods. We must fully develop under efficient, able direction every psychological weapon that is available to us.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I yield to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Am I correct in believing that all the statements which the distinguished Senator from Illinois has quoted were made during the Presidential campaign of 1952?

Mr. DOUGLAS. The Senator is correct.

I believe those pledges were straightforward and clear. I believe that there were no "ifs" or "buts" about them.

I welcomed those statements. I thought that General Eisenhower, Mr. Dulles, and other speakers for the Republican Party were very unjust in the charges they made about the Truman administration and Mr. Acheson. They attacked the Truman policy of containment. They said they had another policy, namely, liberation. It never seemed to me that those were antithetical or opposed policies. We must contain a force before we can roll it back. Therefore it seemed to me that the criticism of the policy of containment was wrong. But I recognized the fact that we were in a stage in which, after communism had been contained by the wise policies of Truman, it was quite proper that we should attempt to roll it back and to liberate the subject peoples.

I believe, therefore, that what I am proposing is clearly in line with the campaign pledges made to the American people in 1952, by President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles, and that there is no basic principle by which the administration can, in good conscience, object to the plan I am putting forward.

But, Mr. President, I wish to be fair and I wish to stay away from a partisan position on this subject which is so important to the free world, to the American people, and to the subjugated peoples behind the Iron Curtain. For that reason, let me argue in detail the objective which the State Department raised to my amendment.

I ask unanimous consent that, at this point in my remarks, there be printed a copy of the letter which the State Department sent to the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in which they object to my amendment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D. C., June 12, 1956.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In accordance with a request by your staff, we have reviewed an

amendment to H. R. 10082 intended to be proposed by Senator DOUGLAS which would create a new Freedom Administration, as an independent agency of the United States Government.

The executive branch is in full accord with the policy stated in this proposal, that is, to keep alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. As you know, many of our programs are pointed exactly toward this objective. The mutual security program, including the United States escapee program, and the activities of the United States Information Agency are examples of this effort now being carried on by the Government.

The Department of State does not, however, feel it can endorse the passage of this amendment for a number of reasons:

1. The Freedom Administration would operate in an area directly impinging on the foreign relations and policies of the United States, but would, although subject to presidential supervision, be independent of the President's principal adviser on foreign policy, the Secretary of State. At the same time, one of the chief functions of the Freedom Administration—the making of monetary grants to certain anti-Communist organizations—would by law be subject to consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence. This provision, especially when linked with the mutual security program, would in itself bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks.

2. The executive branch does, of course, share Senator DOUGLAS' desire to see free institutions restored to the countries and peoples of Eastern Europe now incorporated against their will either within the U. S. S. R. or subjected to its domination. However, once we agree that war is excluded as a means to attain this objective and that other means are required, the most careful attention must be given to the means actually chosen. Certain activities can best be undertaken by agencies of the United States Government, while other steps can be most properly carried out through private, nongovernmental groups.

3. If by grants of public funds the Freedom Administration publicly recorded direct Government interest in certain anti-Communist organizations, there would be the danger that such organizations would immediately take on the character and limitations of official operations, thereby impinging upon similar activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies. Moreover, the appeal which such activities offer as representative national and private groups to the people of the captive nations would thereby be sacrificed.

In addition to the above policy objections there are serious administrative difficulties which would make the proposed amendment unworkable.

Should there be other aspects of this matter which you or Senator DOUGLAS believe should be privately discussed, we should be happy to review them with you and him at any time.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the transmittal to your committee of the report contained in this letter.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. HILL,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. DOUGLAS. First of all, Mr. President, they say that they are in "full accord" with the policy stated in my proposal. Then, however, they object to my amendment. I believe that their objections will not stand analysis and I propose to analyze them now.

They say that the making of monetary grants to certain "anti-Communist" organizations when linked with the

mutual security program would "in itself bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks."

Mr. President, that objection is one that is hard to take seriously. Our country is committed to an anti-Communist policy. Everyone knows that. We voted an extra \$1.1 billion for the Air Force to protect our country and we made no bones about whom it was we feared. The USIA is certainly designed—as a governmental program—to be an "anti-Communist" policy. Do we care that the Russians claim that the USIA is anti-Communist in purpose? Certainly, I do not. So, Mr. President, if our Government, in many different ways is sponsoring and advocating anti-Communist programs, how, in heaven's name, can a program which I am offering and advocating bring the motives of the administration into question and offer a prime target for Soviet-inspired attacks?

I may say in this connection that this objection which the State Department advanced to my amendment would apply equally to the amendment of my colleague, which Mr. Dulles approved, because the amendment of my colleague would permit grants to private organizations engaged in keeping alive the will for freedom behind the Iron Curtain. So apparently if a proposal is advanced by the Democratic Senator from Illinois, it is an improper proposal, but if a similar proposal is advanced by my junior colleague, the Republican Senator from Illinois, it is perfectly proper and praiseworthy. This confirms my long held belief that Mr. Dulles is a Republican before he is anything else and that he is always seeking to put the Democrats, upon whom he depends for support, in a hole. This is apparently his version of bipartisan cooperation. Thank God there are some of us who have higher standards than that.

What motives would be under attack? Are we not proud that our motives are to give hope and freedom to those who are now in chains behind the Iron Curtain? Perhaps the State Department is afraid that that motive might be attacked, but I say that is a decent motive. I say that is a motive which is our national policy. I say that is a motive which the Congress has passed on time and time again, and one for which we have appropriated billions and billions of dollars. And why should we be concerned that the Soviet would inspire attacks on such a Freedom Administration? Of course, they would inspire attacks on it. Are we to sit back and fold our hands because through a Freedom Administration, through a large Air Force, through a huge defense budget, and through our mutual security program, we offer the Soviet Union prime targets for attack? I believe that this argument of the State Department is one which cannot stand the test of analysis and, if we accepted it, we would now cut our defenses, stop our mutual security program, junk the USIA, do away with the CIA, and give up the refugee escapee program. The Communists have aimed their attacks at these acts and organizations. That

merely proves how effective they are. And the Communists would aim their attacks at the Freedom Administration which, so far as I am concerned, is a very valid reason for adopting it.

The second objection which the State Department makes is that "certain activities can best be undertaken by agencies of the United States Government, while other steps can be most properly carried out through private nongovernmental organizations."

I gather that their objection is that my amendment would give the weight and backing of the United States Government to the Freedom Administration program to keep the spirit of freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain. I gather that the State Department believes that this should be done by private groups. I think there are a number of valid answers to that objection.

First, I believe that it should be the policy of the United States Government to keep freedom alive behind the Iron Curtain. Further, I believe that the administration is committed to that—not just that it is to be carried out by private agencies—but is committed to use the agencies for Government to obtain that. That certainly is what our diplomacy should be aimed at. That certainly is what the CIA, the USIA, the President's special fund, and the mutual security program is aimed at. There can be no objection that this program should not be carried out by the United States Government. That is a foolish objection, for the object and the means I propose are already ones which, in part, at least, the United States Government is committed to.

I found it a bit difficult to understand the confusion on this point. On the one hand, it has been argued that my amendment is not needed because we already do some of these things. Of course, as Members know, we do not do all of the things I am proposing and we have failed to tap all of the resources—like the nationality groups with their special knowledge—to carry out the purpose of my amendment. Nonetheless, my amendment has been objected to on grounds that it is already being done.

But, on the other hand, we find the State Department arguing that the Freedom Administration which I am proposing, and the means by which it should be carried out, should be handled by private nongovernmental groups.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCOTT in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on page 55 I move to strike out section 13, beginning in line 1 and ending in line 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for a half hour on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I would have to object to that, because it would violate the whole unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I understand that when the unanimous-

consent agreement was discussed, it was pointed out that if a Senator needed more time, he could always offer another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator may offer an amendment at the appropriate time.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am sure the Senator from California, for whom I have the highest respect, would wish to have this subject discussed fully, irrespective of how Senators vote on the amendment. I hope he will not object to the request of the Senator from Illinois. It is a fair request.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield time to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wish to address the Chair. I wish to call up an amendment. On page 4 of the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], I seek to strike out—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Such an amendment is not in order at this time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Are we being foreclosed from offering amendments to the bill?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There is no attempt at foreclosure. However, under the unanimous-consent agreement a half hour is allotted to each side on the amendment. When the opposition has had an opportunity to reply to the Senator from Illinois, and when all time on the amendment has expired, it will be in order for a Senator to offer an amendment, at which time the Senator from Illinois or any other Senator will have an additional half hour of time to speak on another amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Does the opposition to the amendment intend to use its time on the amendment, or does it intend to forfeit its time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. We will use some of the time. We may not use all of it. If not, I shall be glad to give some of my time to the Senator from Illinois. However, we do have a number of speakers on the amendment, and I believe the orderly procedure to follow would be to permit the opposition to be heard.

Mr. DOUGLAS. May I ask the distinguished majority leader if he would be willing to yield me not to exceed 8 minutes on the bill?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to cut that request down a little bit. I yield 5 minutes on the bill to the Senator from Illinois. While he is speaking on the additional time, Senators may be able to get together and decide whether they will offer another

amendment. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Yesterday an amendment was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. Subsequently an amendment was substituted by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. At that time I posed the question as to whether we were adopting a system of extending time under the unanimous-consent agreement. I said if we were, I wanted to be notified of that fact, so that the arrangement would apply equally to everyone. I now find that the Senator from Illinois is not privileged to permit another Senator to offer an amendment. I should like to point out that yesterday no one spoke after the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] had spoken, so far as his amendment was concerned.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yesterday the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY] withdrew his amendment, and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] offered another amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I shall resume the discussion after we have had an opportunity to consult with one another and to consider the rules of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes on the bill.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, those who oppose the amendment cannot have it both ways. They cannot argue on the one hand that what I propose is not needed—for it is already being done—and on the other hand that it should not be done by the United States Government but should be carried out by private groups. There is a clear inconsistency in this argument. The facts are that what I am proposing is not being carried out by the American Government; it should be carried out by the American Government, and my amendment provides the means for doing it.

The third objection of the State Department is that if funds were granted to these nationality groups, after approval by the President and by the CIA, and by a majority of the administrators of the program—

There would be the danger that such organizations would immediately take on the character and limitations of official operations, thereby impinging upon similar activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies. Moreover, the appeal which such activities offer as representative national and private groups to the people of the captive nations would thereby be sacrificed.

Now, Mr. President, that is an objection which has already been raised in the first two objections of the State Department. I believe, again, that the State Department cannot have it both ways. They claim that my program would impinge on activities currently being carried out by governmental agencies—which activities apparently do not embarrass the United States—but that if the national and private groups were

given support by the United States Government their special appeal would be sacrificed.

That is an amazing argument. Why is it, then, that the nationality groups support my amendment? Surely, if they thought they would lose their special appeal in gaining freedom for their countrymen, they would oppose my amendment. But, they support it and have urged it, because they know it is yet another method by which their ends—which are the eventual freedom of their countrymen, can be brought about.

And, again, we have conflicting argument that it is already being carried out, and, on the other hand, it should not be carried out. Again, the State Department is trying to argue both ways.

Mr. President, I may say that this is a very serious matter. There has been little or no attempt by the administration to effect liberation. The promises of the administration in the campaign of 1952—that is, the promises of General Eisenhower and Mr. Dulles—probably did help to inspire the abortive armed revolts behind the Iron Curtain in the spring of 1953. However, it was soon found that we had no positive program to support those people. As a result, the leaders were killed or thrown into prison, and it was a net blow to the resistance movement.

We are not proposing an armed revolt at an inopportune time. We are proposing that the spirit of revolt be kept alive, and that a collective slowdown be encouraged, which would be almost impossible to detect and which would be extremely effective in its operation.

Unless we do something to help sustain the spirit of resistance behind the Iron Curtain, we will likely lose out.

A few weeks ago one of the leading members of the Polish Government in exile in London, a man whose previous record had been that of a devoted anti-Communist, announced he was returning to Poland. He said he was returning to Poland because of his disgust with the policies of the American and British Governments.

He had concluded that neither the United States nor Great Britain meant business, and that the only thing to do was for him to make terms with the Communist Government of Poland.

Mr. President, in the riots which started yesterday and which may be going on now in Poland the heroic people of that nation, with their bare hands, have risen against their masters, and, according to the Warsaw-controlled radio, 38 have been killed and 270 wounded. I think we should send a message of hope to them, and I submit that my amendment would do that.

Mr. President, I do not believe the State Department has a single valid argument against my proposal. They say they are in full accord with the policy of my amendment and then turn around and put forward a number of obviously inconsistent arguments.

We are not to do this, according to them, because the Communists might attack our motives. But we all know the Communists attack our motives at

every step. When we help colonial peoples to freedom we are accused of being anticolonial. When we arm to keep ourselves strong against the huge Russian military machine, we are accused of being militaristic. When we wish to share our atom knowledge, under proper safeguards, with the rest of the world and to have adequate inspection of atomic facilities throughout the world, we are accused of wanting to foment an atom war. Mr. President, let us not be dissuaded because the Communists might attack our motives.

In summary, Mr. President, I believe that this amendment should be adopted. It is needed.

Its purposes are unobjected to.

The arguments against it are inconsistent.

The policies it would carry out have been proclaimed by the President and his Secretary of State.

The Congress of the United States has supported its aims by dozens of its actions.

Therefore, I hope the Senate will adopt the amendment and that we can give this further encouragement to the peoples of the Iron Curtain.

Mr. President, I have been glad to send to Chicago to the great meeting honoring the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the first Premier of Poland, on the 15th anniversary of his death, today, the following message:

I not only join with you in honoring the memory of a great world citizen, Ignace Jan Paderewski, but I share with you the deep feelings of encouragement at the dramatic new evidence of the undying determination of the Polish people to struggle for their freedom despite the most brutal and oppressive tyranny. I hope the Congress will answer the courageous resistance of the people of Poznan by taking affirmative action to establish a Freedom Administration to encourage and assist all proper efforts to liberate the people of Poland and other Iron Curtain countries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, may I have 1 more minute?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I hope I can further tell this great Chicago meeting of Polish Americans honoring the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski that the Senate of the United States has taken action today to encourage the liberation of those under Communist subjugation by approving this amendment, and that we can send a message of hope not only to the victims of tyranny in Poland itself but to all others who suffer under Communist rule. This would be the most fitting tribute of all—positive action for liberation—to the memory of that great statesman and fighter for freedom, Ignace Jan Paderewski.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I join with the distinguished Senator from Illinois in my interest in foreign populations and the people behind

the Iron Curtain. I believe my record will show that I have been rather active in that field ever since I have been a Member of the Senate. But I think the approach of the Senator from Illinois to this question is the wrong approach.

I understand the Senate has already adopted an amendment, offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which covers the same field in a less elaborate way.

The argument which the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] has made does not strike me as being valid. Certainly, we must do all we can. We have built a foundation, and now we are asked to erect a new edifice—to establish a new executive branch agency. This would interfere with the State Department's functions in the foreign-policy field, would cause confusion about United States policies, and would necessitate coordination with existing agencies. It would raise false hopes, in my judgment, in the minds of the people behind the Iron Curtain.

The amendment calls for eight deputy administrators appointed on a basis of national origins. This idea is contrary to United States traditions of proper qualifications for public office. Frankly, I think it is questionable whether we should use national origins as a basis for such appointments.

The Freedom Administration would be a Government corporation. This form of organization is inconsistent with the tasks which the agency would be called upon to perform.

The amendment would authorize the appropriation of \$20 million in each fiscal year for use by the Freedom Administration. This would be in addition to the amounts in the bill recommended by the committee. There is no program for using this new amount, so that the Senate has no idea whether such an appropriation makes sense or not.

Furthermore, it seems to me the Commission would be rather fancy in its general setup. The amendment calls for a Commissioner at a salary of \$17,500 a year, and for 8 deputies at \$15,000 apiece, and the deputies are to be chosen from certain nationalities in this country.

I cannot imagine how such a Commission would operate or that it could operate in the manner contemplated. The amendment would make available to the Freedom Administration any foreign currencies owned by the United States. This authority would be without control by Congress, since it would be exempt from controls established by section 1415 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1953.

I am familiar with the general program of student exchange and with how that program is financed. I am wondering whether it is intended to take the use of foreign currencies used for that important program to finance this Freedom Administration.

The amendment would duplicate the authority already existing in the Mutual Security Act of 1954, in sections 401, 403, and 405, to carry out programs consistent with the purpose of the amendment. The amendment would also duplicate authority granted to the State Department and the USIA.

Section 401 of the act provides:

Not to exceed \$100,000,000 of the funds available under this section may be expended for any selected persons who are residing in or escapees from the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Albania, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia or the Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Germany, or any Communist-dominated or Communist-occupied areas of Asia and any other countries absorbed by the Soviet Union, either to form such persons into elements of the military forces supporting the North Atlantic Treaty Organization or for other purposes, when the President determines that such assistance will contribute to the defense of the North Atlantic area or to the security of the United States.

It seems to me that this section is more comprehensive and more in line with our present setup than this new proposal would be.

Of course, there is always a danger that establishing an organization of this kind would give rise to Soviet propaganda against the United States to the effect that this agency is the only United States agency interested in freedom. It does not seem to me to be the appropriate way to handle the matter.

So, Mr. President, I express my opposition to the amendment offered by my distinguished colleague from Illinois, at the same time assuring him that I am deeply concerned with the whole problem of the people behind the Iron Curtain and sympathize with their desire for freedom. It should continue to be our purpose to give them every hope of freedom from Communist oppression.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I am responsible only for my own conduct, and I trust that whatever I may do here will be supported by the Senate.

There is nothing so irresistible as attack. On the 12th day of February I was in Chicago addressing a meeting, and at that time the question of whether something more should be done to aid the nationality groups in this country to keep alive the spirit of freedom and hope was very widely discussed. I came back to the Nation's Capital a few days later, and, shortly thereafter, I addressed a letter to the very distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. That letter was responded to by the very distinguished clerk of that committee, Dr. Marcy. And may I say that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate is certainly honored by having as committee clerk one of the very finest gentlemen I ever knew. He is not only a scholar, but, in every sense, he is a gentleman. So, Mr. President, when I want to know anything I go to the very indispensable group of clerks of committees who know the score.

I presented the matter to Dr. Marcy, and he said that in due course it would come before the committee. I submitted certain language at that time, and when the hearings on the foreign aid bill began, that language was considered, but it was laid on the table. It was mentioned to me at the time that my distinguished colleague had also sub-

mitted an amendment, and that his amendment was also laid on the table.

I then said to Dr. Marcy, "I wonder if we cannot revise the language so as to make it acceptable to the committee."

A few days later the language was revised and was submitted to me. I made a few modifications in the revised form, and I have carried the amendment very religiously with me since the debate began.

I have been very attentive to this matter, because I have been interested in it, as have other Senators. When the session began at noon today, I found myself beset with two committee sessions, and I came to the Senate Chamber at 12:30.

But I remind my colleague that on yesterday I talked with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], when he was presiding over this body, and suggested two amendments which I desired to offer. I came into the Chamber today and, at his suggestion, deferred offering the amendments on the ground that it was perhaps too early for the committee to accept any amendments to be taken to conference.

The result was that I went to lunch. While I was at lunch, word came to me to return to the Chamber; that there was an opportunity to present the amendments. I presented them. There was no objection. Both of them were agreed to.

I cannot be responsible whether other Senators are in their places. I give an accounting only of my own stewardship. In so doing, I never reflect upon any other Member of this body.

The Senator from Georgia very graciously accepted both amendments. Then I went about my business, first to a subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary dealing with judges, and then to hear testimony upstairs, where there is a room full of witnesses.

It was not until I came into the Chamber to respond to a quorum call that I got a message from my office stating that my distinguished senior colleague was going to refer to the fact that my amendments had been offered.

I simply submit that there are a number of persons in the world and quite a number of persons in this body who have had a continuing interest in the question of liberation. I have declaimed it from the housetops and from platforms in probably two-thirds of the States of the Union. So I make no apologies for my action, because I feel as deeply on this subject, and I am just as close to those groups, as is any other Member of the Senate.

Therefore, my conduct was entirely circumspect. If there is any quarrel about the language in which my amendment is couched, I can only say that I enlisted the aid of the very distinguished clerk of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that I proposed this matter almost 6 months ago, when the foreign-aid bill was scarcely in the incubation stage.

I know also of the difficulty of selling an amendment on the floor of the Senate. So it was, some days ago, that I importuned the Department of State concerning the necessity for doing some-

thing on this subject. It took me quite some time to get all the answers I wanted. At long last, I contacted one of the officials of the Department and said, "Now I want some kind of answer." That answer came to me yesterday afternoon in the form of a letter signed by the Secretary of State, the Honorable John Foster Dulles. He said the Department supported the proposal in the form in which it was submitted today.

I do not know what the Department did about the proposal of my colleague, but I know that the State Department has indicated its support of my amendment over the signature of the Secretary of State.

I understand that some reference was made to class A and class B Senators. Selfishly, I hope I shall always be in class A. I do not know what the distinction is between the two, but I do know that any Member of the Senate, regardless of his political persuasion and his partisan affiliation, can always get an answer from the State Department, and can always get polite, courteous treatment.

But I did not wait when I was notified that the Committee on Foreign Relations had laid my amendment on the table along with the amendment of my distinguished colleague. I then went to work to prepare my amendment in a form which would be acceptable, and I labored further to get the approval of the State Department.

So I am grateful, indeed, that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations should have said today, in the very brief discussion we had, that he thought the amendment had merit.

I add only one other thing, namely, that the amendment is amendatory of a section which is already in the bill.

Everyone knows of the Kersten Act, which deals with this matter. One hundred and fifty million dollars was made available, of which \$100 million was designed to create smaller components of escapees, in the interest of the support of the United States, the amount to be spent under the direction of the President of the United States.

My amendment is a complete departure from the proposal which is presently pending. It merely authorizes an increase of \$5 million for this purpose, expands the purposes somewhat, and eases the administration of the provision by the State Department, because it is quite in line with the basic effort in section 401 of the act.

One other point, and then I shall have finished. I listened to and followed with great interest the speech by the President in August 1954 to the American Legion Convention. I have carried that speech with me. In that speech the President said we must assist the liberation cause by administration. Then he used this language: "By other material means."

So it will be discovered that what I was trying to do was to articulate the program of the President, and the phrase, "by material means," appears in the amendment today. It is a fortuity, of course, that it should come almost on the day when there was a revolt, a protest, and almost a rebellion in Poland

because the people are without bread, and are discovering now what the heavy hand of tyranny and despotism means to them.

I think the amendment comes as a beacon and as a shining light of hope. I trust the amendment will become embedded in the language of the bill, that it will be retained in conference, and that it will be translated into action in the interest of the liberation of peoples for whom the lamps of freedom have long ago been extinguished.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield an additional minute to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The distinguished Senator from Illinois has correctly pointed out that the Kersten amendment made available \$150 million.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. My understanding is that only a relatively small amount of the funds provided in the Kersten amendment have been expended. What I have not been able to understand is why the proposed \$5 million is needed. As a matter of fact, I feel certain the Senator from Illinois knows that that is really the reason why the Committee on Foreign Relations decided not to add such an amendment to the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I say to my friend from Alabama, first, that I was not advised, and I am not advised, as to how much of the \$150 million under the Kersten amendment has been expended. They are unvouchered funds, and the President does not give an account of them. I did not feel free to ask, in the state of the law, for an accounting to ascertain how much money was available. I wanted to be sure, therefore, that funds were available. Whether it is \$1 million, \$5 million, or \$10 million is not nearly so important as that the language of the provision in the existing law be broadened so that this program can go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Illinois has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota will state it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Has all time been used on this particular amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that whatever time remains is under the control of the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND].

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, would the Senator from Minnesota like to have me yield him some time? I have some remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I say most respectfully to the Senator from California that it is my intention to offer an amendment to strike certain sections of this particular amendment, which I think might be somewhat helpful.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In order to facilitate the situation, I am prepared to

yield back all my remaining time so that the Senator from Minnesota can offer his amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I say most kindly to the minority leader that if he needs some time on the basis of the amendment I am about to offer, I shall be happy to yield time to him from my side.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator from Minnesota is generous. I am certain we shall get along all right.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time has been yielded back or has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the Douglas amendment on page 3 to strike out beginning with line 4 through line 4 on page 4.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator restate his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. On page 3, starting with line 4, strike out all the language on that page through line 25; and on page 4, beginning on line 1, strike out the language through line 4. The amendment would be concluded with subsection (e) (1), on page 4, and the language thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANSFIELD in the Chair). The Chair inquires of the Senator from Minnesota how much time he allocates to himself.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I allocate 10 minutes to myself at this time.

Mr. President, the news in the morning radio broadcasts and in the morning press concerning the revolt, or at least the uprising, as Poznan, in Poland, indicates to us, I think, the importance of this particular amendment, as modified by the amendment the junior Senator from Minnesota has just offered.

The purpose of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois for himself and other Senators is to make it crystal clear once again that an important part of the foreign policy of the United States is to do everything within our powers—the peaceful and legitimate powers of this Government—to offer hope to persons behind the Iron Curtain, particularly those in the enslaved countries which were taken over by the Soviet Union following World War II, and the Baltic States, which were taken over by the Soviet Union in earlier years, around 1940.

Mr. President, in conferences some of us have had with the free leaders of the enslaved countries, such as representatives from Poland, Lithuania, Romania, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and other countries behind the Iron Curtain, we have been informed that there is a growing sense of despair and hopelessness among the people behind the Iron Curtain.

I was happy to see this morning, however, that in Poland the passion for independence and the dedication to freedom still live. I should like to suggest, Mr. President, at this time, that if for no other reason, the amendment ought to be adopted to indicate to the patriots of Poland that the Government of the United States, the greatest free government on the face of the earth, and the people of the United States, who love

freedom dearly, have not forgotten their friends and their neighbors in other areas of the world who aspire to national independence and national freedom, and who are willing literally to lay down their lives to throw off the yoke of Communist imperialism and communism.

If there ever was a time, I may say to my friend from Illinois, when the amendment he has offered was appropriate, it is this hour, because, even as we speak in this Chamber today, thousands of men and women, workers in factories, shopkeepers, students, and farmers in Poland are protesting openly, at the risk of their lives—as students did only recently in Czechoslovakia; as 2 years ago German workers did in many of the cities of Germany behind the Iron Curtain. At that time apparently we had, despite all the pronouncements made, no policy whatsoever.

PADEREWSKI

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota subsequently said: Mr. President, at the point in my remarks where I was referring to the uprising in Poland, I should like to note that today marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the world renowned artist and Polish patriot. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement which I have prepared in that connection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today when the news from Poznan gives us new evidence that the fire of human liberty still burns brightly in Polish hearts, it is fitting that we should pause to commemorate the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, the world-renowned composer and pianist, and great Polish patriot.

Paderewski was a close friend of Woodrow Wilson, and it was this friendship that lent strength to Wilson's insistence on the self-determination of all nations, including Poland. Paderewski was the first Premier of the newly freed Polish Republic in 1919. During the turbulent years between the two world wars, he played a major role in the difficult adjustment of his nation to the independence the Poles had acquired after generations of subjugation under the Russians and Germans.

Always dedicated to his country's freedom, Paderewski refused to perform public concerts after the fall of Poland at the beginning of World War II. He died in New York City on June 30, 1941, still President of the exiled Parliament.

The dedication of Paderewski to Polish independence inspires the Poles today. While the Wilsonian doctrine of the self-determination of nations remains a strong force in the motivation of American foreign policy, the United States must pay heed to these Polish aspirations. The United States Senate should look upon this commemoration of the death of Paderewski as a reminder of our international responsibilities as a continuing supporter of the cause of oppressed and captive nations everywhere.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, have we here in the Senate forgotten those fateful and eventful hours in Germany 2 years ago, when workers walked out of the factories; when we saw, as demonstrated from photographs obtained, German workers beating on tanks with bare fists, German

workers standing up against machine-guns with sticks and stones, Germans who wanted to be free, who wanted no further nazism, and wanted nothing more of communism?

We were without a policy, I submit. We knew not what to do, except, apparently, to send emergency food to people who could cross the line, the so-called Iron Curtain, and go into West Germany or the free sections of Berlin.

The amendment of the Senator from Illinois, in its preamble, really gives a ringing declaration of independence and freedom. It states:

It is the declared policy of the Congress to resist the spread of communism. The issue between the free and the slave world is essentially whether freedom shall survive. The struggle to preserve freedom, however, is not to be won solely by further resistance to enslavement, but also by keeping alive in the hearts of enslaved people the spirit and hope of freedom. It is the purpose of this section to advance the cause of freedom by providing aid and support to those groups which are actively engaged in maintaining, inspiring, and instilling that spirit and hope.

I have read the language of the first section of the amendment. This is its purpose and objective, and it is an objective to which every freedom-loving person in the United States of America subscribes.

The language following, in subsection (b), wherein there is created an agency under the name of "Freedom Administration," is but an outline of the administrative procedure or administrative program for carrying out the previously announced objectives.

There may be those who say we do not need a separate administrator in this area. There may be those who say we surely do not need deputy administrators. Mr. President, if there is one place where we need concentration of effort, it is in this field to which we are addressing ourselves, so as to coordinate and centralize the policies of this Government as they relate to keeping alive the hopes and the aspirations of people behind the Iron Curtain for their ultimate liberation and freedom.

I regret to say that, because of the wide diffusion in the respective agencies of our Government of the responsibility for programs for emancipation and liberation, far too little is being done, or, if it is being done, Mr. President, its effectiveness is lost because of confusion and diffusion—confusion of purpose and diffusion of responsibility.

I feel this amendment, if adopted, will at least indicate to the administration and to nations throughout the world that there is a growing and ever-deepening concern over the fate of peoples who are enslaved. This is the right time for the declaration. If we can believe only a part of what we read, if we can believe only a little bit as to the troubles in the Communist parties in some countries, if we can believe that there is some difficulty in the Kremlin—and may I say that our State Department indicates again and again that there are grave difficulties and problems amongst the leadership of the Kremlin—if we can believe, for example, that the flame of liberty and freedom still burns in the

hearts and minds of people behind the Iron Curtain, particularly in those countries which were grabbed up and enslaved after World War II—if we can believe this, and I think we have a right to, in the light of the moving and inspiring news we received this morning, then it is time for the Congress of the United States to do something specifically to help those people.

Mr. President, there are now in America free leaders from Rumania, from Hungary, from Czechoslovakia, from Poland, from Lithuania, from Estonia, from Latvia, from Albania, and from other countries which are behind the Iron Curtain. Many of them are here under the good offices of our Government. Many of them are here because they seek to live in a land of freedom, not only momentarily, but for the rest of their lives. But these persons, these wonderful men and women, who have demonstrated bravery and courage in resisting any form of totalitarianism, have come to Members of the Senate and have asked us why we do not do something just a little more concrete than we have been doing. That is what the amendment proposes to do.

If the amendment were to be taken to conference, it would do two things. First. It would indicate the overall consensus of the Senate of the United States on this issue.

Second. Let me say that if the amendment involves some difficulties in administration, with the result that the amendment requires more refining, I suggest that such matters could be worked out by the conferees.

Frankly, Mr. President, I happen to be one who believes that we are not using all the talent that is available in our country.

Therefore, this particular amendment provides for Deputy Administrators, one of whom shall be of German descent, one of whom shall be of Polish descent, one of whom shall be of Lithuanian descent, one of whom shall be of Latvian descent, one of whom shall be of Estonian descent, one of whom shall be of Czech descent, one of whom shall be of Ukrainian descent, and one of whom shall be of such descent as to represent the remaining Slovak peoples in the Communist world.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to say that I have been impressed by the words of the Senator from Minnesota, but of course actions speak louder than words. I wonder how the Senator from Minnesota voted yesterday on the Bridges amendment, which would cut off American aid to a Communist country which is dedicated to Leninism, which is dedicated to the destruction of our country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin does not need to ask me, for I know he reads the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He knows that I voted to support the President of the United States and the Secretary of State, who pleaded with us to do exactly what the junior Senator from

Minnesota voted to have the United States do.

In view of some of the votes which were cast on yesterday, I am beginning to wonder whether the Secretary of State had one speech for the Republican caucus and another speech for the Foreign Relations Committee. However, I wish to reconcile that doubt by saying that I imagine what the Secretary of State told those of us who serve on the Foreign Relations Committee was exactly what he told the Republican caucus.

Mr. President, I have no apologies to make for my vote on yesterday; and I say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I have nothing to apologize for in my long fight against totalitarianism. Let me say that I was fighting against totalitarianism long before some other Members took up that fight. Therefore, I think I know whereof I speak.

In this case I am addressing myself to an attempt to crystalize the hope of the peoples behind the Iron Curtain; and I believe that my amendment to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], on behalf of himself and certain other Senators, will do just that.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield further to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, although I have gotten along very well with the able junior Senator from Minnesota, when he says he has no apologies to make for his vote in favor of having the United States give approximately \$95 million to a Communist country—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, is the Senator from Wisconsin asking me a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes, I am going to ask a question.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I hope the Senator from Wisconsin will proceed to ask his question, then.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota does not mind receiving a compliment first, does he?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. No; but I should like to have the Senator from Wisconsin ask the question he has in mind.

Mr. McCARTHY. Does not the junior Senator from Minnesota honestly feel that every Senator who voted in favor of giving \$95 million of aid to a Communist country, to strengthen the Communist economy and to build its armament, even though that country has devoted itself to Leninism—and let me say that I assume that the Senator from Minnesota was completely sincere and honest in so voting, as were the other Senators who voted for that proposal—think the time will come when all Senators who voted for the giving of aid

by us to Communist countries will wish to apologize for voting in that way? I emphasize that I am not accusing those Senators of being insincere; I assume that they had some reasons for voting as they did. What the reasons were, I do not know.

But does not the junior Senator from Minnesota think that all Senators who voted in favor of that proposal will at some time in the future, if and when the war machine they are helping to build up in Yugoslavia is used against American young men, really have an apology to make?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, let me say to my friend, the Senator from Wisconsin, that what the junior Senator from Minnesota did was to vote for the amendment reading as follows:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance under this title or any other title of this act, or under any provision of law repealed by section 542 (a) of this act, shall be furnished to Yugoslavia after the expiration of 90 days following the date of the enactment of this section, unless the President finds—

And then we added the amendment submitted by the Senator from Wyoming, namely—

and so reports to the Congress, with his reasons therefor—

And then the committee amendment continued as follows:

(1) that there has been no change in the Yugoslavian policies on the basis of which assistance under this act has been furnished to Yugoslavia in the past, and that Yugoslavia is independent of control by the Soviet Union,

And then the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming added these words:

(2) that Yugoslavia does not adhere to any policy for the Communist conquest of the world and (3)—

And then the committee amendment provides—

that it is in the interest of the national security of the United States to continue the furnishing of assistance to Yugoslavia under this act.

Mr. President, what the junior Senator from Minnesota did—and let me say that I shall not take much more time on this matter—was to vote in favor of the giving of assistance to Yugoslavia if the President of the United States—who is the President of everyone in the United States, and who is vested by the Constitution with the responsibilities of Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces and the responsibilities of being our chief spokesman in foreign affairs—feels that it is in the interest of national security that such assistance be granted.

Let me say to my colleague, the Senator from Wisconsin, that he has voted, as have other Senators, for aid to Yugoslavia; he did so last year, and he did so the year before, and he did so the year before that. And let me point out that Tito was just as Red then as he is now, and let me also point out that he was then just as much of a Communist as he is today. The only difference is that now—at least, according to some persons—Tito, of Yugoslavia, has been able

to get the Soviet Union to recognize his independence from the Comintern.

Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that if there are any apologies to be made, they are to be made by those who are responsible for the foreign policy of this country, those who only a few weeks ago requested the Senate and the House of Representatives not to tie the President's hands.

I am rather surprised to find that the main trouble the President has, again and again, in connection with his foreign policy is with his own party. Let me say that it was not easy for me to rise in the Senate and say—knowing that it is an unpopular matter, knowing that politics can be played with it, knowing that demagogery can be played with it—that I am willing to trust the President and the Secretary of State, despite the extent to which I have disagreed with both of them; and, Mr. President, believe me, my record of disagreement is replete and clear. Despite the extent to which I have disagreed with them, I was not willing to substitute my opinion regarding what should be done in this instance for the opinion of the President of the United States and the opinion of the Secretary of State.

Therefore, I have no apologies to make. If apologies are to be made, they will have to be made by those who requested faith in them. I thought that, at least, inasmuch as the President was as sick as he was, it might be good to give him a little expression of faith. I am sorry that many others did not share that feeling with me.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield for a correction?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Of course, Mr. President; I am always willing to yield for a correction.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator from Minnesota said that I voted for aid to Yugoslavia, last year. He is mistaken; I opposed aid to Yugoslavia, last year. I voted for the overall mutual aid bill.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. That is correct.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did that despite the fact that I thought it was unwise for us to give aid to Yugoslavia. I voted for the bill because of the aid we were giving to some of our real allies.

Let me say that this year I will vote against the entire mutual aid bill, so long as it contains provision for aid to a Communist country, even though I very strongly feel that we should give aid to our allies in the East—such as Formosa, South Vietnam, South Korea, Pakistan, and other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I appreciate the point of view of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I feel very badly that I have to vote against such aid; but I cannot vote for a bill which will give \$95 million of aid to a Communist country.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am not happy about voting for it, either; and I am not happy about having aid go to some other countries which, although they may not be Communist, have in themselves every bit as

much iniquity and evil as can be found in Yugoslavia.

However, even though there are partisan differences, yet there are times when we reconcile our doubts—as I did in the case of the treaty with Formosa, and as I did in the case of our bases in north Africa, Spain, and elsewhere. After all, we have to have faith in someone.

We must have some faith, and I suggest that it is running a little thin in some parts of the political spectrum in this country.

I now yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Illinois, as proposed to be amended by the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one point?

Mr. LEHMAN. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I wonder if the Senator from Illinois would be willing to accept the amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accept the amendment, and ask that my amendment be modified accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Before the Senator accepts it finally, I should like to ascertain from the Chair if that would result in cutting off the time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Then I shall postpone the request.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I withhold my acceptance, with the understanding that at the appropriate time I will accept the amendment.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the people whom we hope to help and encourage through the enactment of this provision of the mutual security bill have received many promises in the past. But the implementation of those promises has been so sterile that they are becoming increasingly discouraged and almost hopeless. They feel that we have been making a great many promises, but have been falling down in the performance of such promises.

During the 1952 campaign a glowing prospect for liberation was held out to the people of the enslaved countries by the Republican Party. After the election, those promises were completely forgotten and discarded by the candidates who had been elected to highest office. It is not surprising that they were abandoned. Obviously, they were merely insincere campaign pledges. Certainly no steps whatsoever have been taken to carry them out.

Since that time—1952—in an ever-growing degree, the feeling of disillusionment in the countries which are captive behind the Iron Curtain has grown to such an extent that today the people living in those enslaved countries are virtually hopeless.

The amendment which has been offered by the Senator from Illinois makes

no promises which are unattainable. It holds out no prospects of achievement that cannot be realized. It does not urge revolt at this time. It does strongly hold out hope. It does give assurance to the enslaved people of the continued interest and sympathy of the American people, and of their intention to do everything possible to maintain and foster the spirit of liberty which we have ever held to be the dearest possession of any democratic nation. We pray with all our hearts that the enjoyment of liberty will soon again become an achieved fact in the countries behind the Iron Curtain and we intend to do what we can to bring that happy day about.

The enslaved countries who will be affected by this amendment have large populations. They have been freedom-loving peoples for generations—in some for centuries—although in many cases they were unhappily deprived of their liberties at different times. However, the torch of liberty, the hope of freedom, and the determination to attain freedom and liberty again, even at the risk of death, have never been extinguished. They have always remained bright in the face of the greatest and most tragic discouragement. Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Albania, and others were all countries which have fought and made indescribable sacrifices for the preservation of their liberty over generations, yet today they are enslaved people, without any real hope of early liberation. Their slender hope will ever grow weaker unless it is encouraged by their friends in the West and it must be encouraged not merely with words, but with deeds.

I have known many of the leaders of the captive countries. I worked closely with many of them during the war years from 1939 to 1945. I have since talked with many of them who are today in exile in this country, or abroad—with some of them I have spoken only a few days ago. Those with whom I have spoken all agree that the inclusion of this amendment in the mutual security bill would provide a great source of encouragement to their people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. May I have 3 minutes more?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, may I inquire how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield 2 more minutes to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I believe we would be losing a great opportunity if we did not include this amendment in the bill. Something has happened recently which has not received the attention and consideration of the American people to the extent that I believe it should have. Years ago, in the early years after the war, Tito declared his independence of Soviet domination. I do not know why he did it. I do not

know what was in his mind, but he did it, and he won his point. He remained independent of complete Soviet domination.

In recent weeks Tito has again visited Russia. He has been hailed anew as a prodigal son, and given notable welcome and honors. He has been received back into the arms of the Soviet Union, which apparently has been willing to recognize his right to declare his personal independence and the independence of his government and of his people.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New York has again expired.

Mr. LEHMAN. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield me 1 more minute?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield 1 more minute to the Senator from New York.

Mr. LEHMAN. I am convinced that what has happened in Russia in recent weeks may be of the greatest encouragement to the captive countries and to the entire free world. I do not believe that from this time on Russia will be able to control the destinies and the actions and policies of such countries in the manner in which she has controlled them in past years. I believe considerable encouragement has already been given to the spirit of independence and liberty in those countries, which will make them far less amenable to the will of the Soviet tyrant. I believe we would be losing a great opportunity in our efforts to bring freedom to the enslaved peoples if we did not approve this amendment.

I pray that we will not reject that opportunity.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back all time on this side, and vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back his time?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Let me say to the minority leader that we are hoping to be able to agree upon a draft which will be acceptable. While the negotiations are in progress, I wonder if the Senator from California would yield me 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. How much time remains?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining. The Senator from California has 30 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota, in order that the negotiations to which he referred may proceed.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I thank the Senator from California.

The Senator from Illinois is the main author of the amendment, and it is my understanding that some of the difficulty involved in connection with the amendment, as it relates to some of our colleagues, concerns the rather detailed arrangement of the administration. I understand the Senator from Illinois may have a further modification to suggest. Is that correct?

Mr. DOUGLAS. That is correct. Because of the parliamentary situation I am forced to accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota to strike the language from line 3 on page 3 to line 5 on page 4. I am ready to accept that amendment. In view of the determined opposition from the other side of the aisle and from the administration, I would be ready to accept, in default of getting nothing, a proper concession by the minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLOTT in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois accept the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accept the amendment, provided it does not exhaust my time, so that another motion can be made by the leadership.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Therefore I have not yet accepted the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Illinois, if he needs some additional time.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I hope the time will be utilized by the distinguished minority leader and the distinguished chairman of the committee in an effort to determine if they will accept as much of the proposal as possible.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished majority whip for that purpose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I would suggest that Senators consult a copy of the amendment, and I should like particularly to have the attention of the Senator from California and the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

I would propose that on page 1, line 8, a period be inserted after the word "freedom"; that the remainder of that line be stricken; that all of pages 2 and 3 be stricken; that the first 16 lines on page 4 be stricken; that on page 4, line 17, subsection (f), lines 17 to 22, be stricken, and there be inserted in lieu thereof the following:

(b) (1) There shall be established in the Treasury Department a special fund which shall be available without fiscal-year limitation for financing the activities authorized by paragraph (a). There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to such fund out of the funds heretofore authorized not to exceed the sum of \$20 million.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am deeply disappointed that the opposition of the State Department and of the administration is so strong that apparently it is impossible to have the Senate adopt the original proposal. I believe that is a great mistake. I am not blaming any of my colleagues. In my informal contacts on the floor, I find it is impossible, in view of the opposition from the other side of the aisle and from the administration, to have the original proposal adopted. Reluctantly, therefore, I will accept the amendment, with the understanding that at a later date we will renew the struggle.

Mr. KNOWLAND. If the distinguished acting majority leader will look at page

5, I believe, in keeping with the action which has already been taken, paragraphs (g) and (h), which refer to the matter which it is proposed to strike out should also be stricken.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have no authority to speak for the Committee on Foreign Relations. The distinguished chairman of the committee is on the floor, and he is the one who has authority to speak for that committee. I will say that the language suggested could be taken to conference, and perhaps in conference there might be a further modification made. Certainly the language would remove the major objection, that the amendment would create a separate board which would conflict with the responsible heads of the State Department.

I am highly sympathetic with the objective of the proposal. I believe the Senator from Illinois will agree that there have been a number of us on both sides of the aisle who, like himself, have been vitally interested in the people who find themselves enslaved behind the Iron Curtain.

I certainly believe it is important that we hold out to them the hope of freedom, and I am convinced that ultimately they will again be free.

Mr. CLEMENTS. It was only in the hope that something might be done in this field and that something might be accomplished along this line that I offered the suggestion. I did not know whether it would be acceptable to the Committee on Foreign Relations. It appeared to me that it offered more hope than anything else which has been suggested in the past.

Mr. DOUGLAS. In view of the opposition of the State Department and of the administration and the opposition of those under the influence of the State Department, I am reluctantly compelled to accept the proposal which has been transmitted by our friend, the majority whip. I will say that frequently the term "take it to conference" means that a proposal is taken to conference and that it ends there. It is similar to the way Richard III took the two young princes into the Tower of London and then strangled them with his own hands. I commend this child to the conferees, in the hope that it may be treated better than were the two young princes in the Tower of London. Let not the State Department or the administration strangle this child in the dark inner recesses of the conference room.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Do I understand correctly that the Senator from Illinois is willing to modify his amendment accordingly?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will accept it. I will not modify it with my own lips. I will accept the modification reluctantly.

My own lips will not pronounce that modification.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah will state it.

Mr. BENNETT. May an amendment be modified by anyone but the Senator who offers the amendment?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I will accept the modification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair states that the amendment may be amended, but not modified by another Senator.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I accept the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Senator from Illinois accepts it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois, as modified.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from California for his splendid cooperation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of our time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield back the remainder of our time, also, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], as modified, to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, it is proposed to insert the following:

(e) Add the following new section:

"Sec. 515. Suspension of aid to countries shipping strategic materials to the Soviet bloc: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which any foreign country exports or knowingly permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China, Communist North Korea and Communist North Indochina), of articles or commodities, shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security, no assistance under this act or under any other act providing financial assistance to foreign countries shall be furnished to such country during the 12-month period following the date of such exportation, or the date on which knowledge thereof is received by the officer or agency administering such assistance, whichever date is later."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY] to the committee amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I take it that the Senator's amendment is different from his amendment identified as "6-28-56-B."

Mr. MCCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, we have not yet had an explanation of the Senator's amendment. After we have had an opportunity to hear his explanation of the amendment, the Senator can then ask for the yeas and nays. Otherwise, if he wanted to modify his own amendment, he might find himself foreclosed from doing so.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I may say to the distinguished minority leader that I do not have an extra copy of my amendment here, but I shall send to my office immediately and get some.

Mr. President, before commencing a discussion of the amendment which was just read by the clerk, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the amendment which I submitted the other day.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MCCARTHY

We are all, of course, extremely happy about the release of the 15 American airmen who were held prisoner by the Chinese Communists. Unfortunately, however, the impression has grown that the prisoner of war situation in China is a closed account. The public has been led to believe that, while there may be some American civilians in China, all of our Korean prisoners of war have been released. This is entirely untrue.

Last spring the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations reported that there were 481 servicemen who are known to have been alive and in Chinese prison camps and still unaccounted for. Last month Defense and State Department officials set the current figure at 450.

As we all know, the Chinese Communists were obliged, under the Korean armistice agreement, to release all prisoners of war as of September 1953. Nearly 3 years have now elapsed and the Communists have still failed to keep their word with respect to 450 American men.

During last year's hearings, the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations learned from top State and Defense Department officials that our Government had done nothing toward obtaining the release of the prisoners beyond requesting the United Nations, through its Secretary General, to make representations to Peiping. Since that time, we know that our Ambassador to Czechoslovakia, Mr. Alexis Johnson, has been conducting negotiations with the Chinese in Geneva, and that as a result, 15 uniformed men have been freed. Beyond this, however, we know only that the balance are being held in Communist prisons or are dead.

Perhaps our Government is making efforts to release the remaining 450 prisoners. Perhaps our Government is still doing nothing. But if efforts are being made, they have produced no results. There are still 450 American men in Communist prison camps. How much brainwashing and brutality they are subjected to, we, of course, do not know. I believe that, under the circumstances, Congress has no alternative but to take the matter into its own hands.

I believe Congress must now do what I have urged it to do for the past 2 years—namely, cut off aid to any foreign country that trades with Communist China while Americans are being held prisoner in China. The Chinese need Western trade and they are getting plenty of it now, especially with the British. If this trade should be halted, I think there is a good chance that the

Communists will release the prisoners. If they fail to do so, we will then have to take sterner measures.

I do not believe that any Member of the Congress or of the executive branch feels easy with himself knowing that our Government has abandoned its fighting men. How can we justify ourselves in appropriating for foreign countries a billion dollars here and a billion there, supposedly for the purpose of fighting world communism, when we neglect to lift a finger to protect our fighting men—when we make no attempt to free those American men who have undergone a loss of personal liberty, all in the service of their country.

Moral cowardice is one of the explanations of the sad state of world affairs. It is one of the reasons other nations do not keep their agreements with us. They don't have to. They can get away with deceit, treachery, and broken promises. They can insult us and then thumb their noses. What respect can you have, after all, for a nation that abandons its fighting men after a war is over? The world must know that when an American soldier goes overseas, he is backed by the entire strength and power of the United States of America.

Those 450 servicemen now languishing in Communist prisons have served their country well. They have done their duty as patriotic Americans. I am a believer in the perhaps antiquated notion that the Nation owes the same duty to the soldier that the soldier owes to the Nation.

For that reason, I have offered an amendment which provides that we cut off all aid to any nation which is shipping goods to Communist China while it holds American prisoners.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I believe that the amendment that I am introducing this afternoon is an absolute must for this year's foreign aid bill in the light of the recent investigation of East-West trade by the Senate Subcommittee on Investigations. My amendment provides that no foreign aid funds be made available to any nation that ships strategic war materials to the Soviet bloc.

The East-West trade investigation, which began 3 years ago under my chairmanship and has been continued under the chairmanship of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] revealed that one of the reasons the Communists are moving ahead of us in the arms race is that the free world is lending a helping hand. Our investigation showed, to be perfectly blunt about it, that American taxpayers are subsidizing the construction of the Communist war machine.

The proof for this charge is very easy to state: countries, such as Great Britain, which have been helped by billions of dollars of American aid, have been selling highly strategic war materials to the Soviet Union—materials that are indispensable for the production of the modern weapons of war.

Moreover, our allies are engaging in this strategic war trade with the express permission of the Government of the United States.

Our committee has discovered that in the summer of 1954, our Government made a secret trade agreement with our allies. This secret agreement—which was made at the behest of the British—permitted our allies to ship to the Soviet Union approximately 200 highly strategic

items that had previously been under strict embargo.

Here are some of the items—machine tools and metals—that were taken off the embargo in 1954:

Horizontal boring machines: These machines, which cost up to half a million dollars apiece, are used to make tanks, aircraft and atomic reactors for *Nautilus*-class submarines.

Precision boring mills, which are used in making radar control mechanisms, engines for jet airplanes, and guided missile components.

Vertical boring mills: These machines are used for making jet engines, guided missiles, turbines, and aircraft armaments.

Mr. President, I may say that this is all a matter of sworn testimony.

Hydraulic and mechanical presses, which are used for making aircraft parts and ammunition shell casings.

Dynamic balancing machines: These machines are used for guided missile engines, gyros and radar control mechanisms.

Surface grinding machines, which are used in making jet engines, guided missiles and radar.

Copper wire, which is indispensable in making engines for jet bombers.

While we are on the subject of copper, let me illustrate how American tax dollars end up paying for weapons that are designed to destroy us. The committee learned that the American Government is financing British copper mining operations in Rhodesia. Thus, with the benefit of direct American aid, the British take the copper out of the ground in Rhodesia, send it to Britain where it is processed into highly strategic copper wire, and then sell it at a British profit to the Communists. Over the past 2 years, Great Britain, along with other countries receiving American aid, shipped over 250 million pounds of copper wire to the Soviet Union. Is it any wonder that the Russians are turning out vast numbers of jet bombers when our allies give them the materials that are indispensable for building those bombers?

But this is not all. Our allies are also sending the Communists aluminum, magnesium, and nickel alloys. These are some of the most strategic materials imaginable. And the list goes on and on. There are, as I said before, approximately 200 strategic items that have been decontrolled. Let me give just one more example, perhaps the most shocking of all. Our so-called allies—countries that live off the American taxpayer—are shipping to the Communists power generators up to 60,000 kilowatts. These generators make fissionable material for atom and hydrogen bombs.

When we permit our allies to ship strategic materials to the Soviet Union, we give far greater benefits to the Communists than if we sold them actual weapons of war. If we sent them ammunition, the ammunition could be shot back at us only once. But when we send them machine tools and strategic metals we give the Communists the means to make destructive weapons over and over again.

It was brought out at our hearings that the Communists need only to buy one of these machine tools—say, the half a million dollar horizontal boring mill—and, by imitating that model, can make dozens more for factories all over the Soviet Union. If the free world possesses one decisively superior weapon, it is our peerless industrial know-how. That weapon we are now handing to the Communists on a silver platter.

I contend that it is hopeless idiocy for the United States, on the one hand, to subsidize a foreign-aid program designed to fight world communism, and on the other, to permit countries receiving that aid to help build the Communist war machine.

How did this incredible situation come about?

The Battle Act of 1951 provided that no nation that shipped strategic materials to the Soviet bloc should receive American aid. However, the Battle Act was circumvented in 1954 by the then Battle Act Administrator, Mr. Harold E. Stassen. Mr. Stassen bypassed the provisions of the act by deciding arbitrarily that certain highly strategic materials, such as those I have mentioned, were not in fact "strategic" for the purposes of allied trade with the Communists.

There is, however, a curious aspect of the 1954 decontrol decision: it applied only to allied exporters. American exporters were denied the opportunity to share in the handsome profits from the Communist trade. The materials I have mentioned are still embargoed as regards American trade with the Soviet bloc. Such materials are considered "non-strategic" for purposes of allied trade. But for purposes of American export, they are considered highly strategic.

My amendment seeks to eliminate this senseless distinction. It aims to prevent our so-called allies from shipping to the Soviet bloc materials that we consider so strategic as to make American shipment of them to the Communists a threat to our national security. The amendment provides that no nation that ships strategic materials to the Communists shall receive any of the funds authorized by this act for a period of 12 months following the date that American officials responsible for administering our aid program receive knowledge of such a shipment.

This is surely a place where Congress must step in and correct the unwise policies of the executive branch. The loophole in the Battle Act, which has been so cynically exploited by certain appeasement-minded officials in the bureaucracy, must be closed by Congress.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were not ordered. Mr. McCARTHY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time taken by the quorum call will be charged to the time of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I am asking for the yeas and nays on my amendment, I ask unanimous consent that the time

for the quorum call not be charged to my time on the amendment.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin request the yeas and nays again?

Mr. McCARTHY. Yes. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on his amendment?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the yeas and nays are ordered on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin.

Does the opposition desire to use any time?

Mr. McCARTHY. If the opposition does not desire to use time, I will yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from California withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Is there not some Senator on the side of the aisle where the Senator from California sits, who would like to use some time at present?

Mr. KNOWLAND. There may be when we have secured a larger attendance of Senators.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the time taken by quorum call being charged to neither side? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, the amendment which is now before the Senate is the one offered today by the distinguished junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. He had previously offered an amendment, which was printed. This amendment, however, slightly changes the concept, though materially it covers the same subject.

For the benefit of Senators who were not present when the amendment was read, I think it should be read at this time. The amendment is as follows:

On page 38, between lines 18 and 19, insert the following:

"(e) Add the following new section:

"Sec. 515. Suspension of aid to countries shipping strategic materials to the Soviet bloc: Notwithstanding any other provision of law, in any case in which any foreign country exports or knowingly permits the exportation, to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or any of its satellite countries (including Communist China, Communist North Korea and Communist North Indochina), of articles or commodities, shipment of which to the Soviet bloc is embargoed, or would be refused export licenses, by the United States in the interest of national security, no assistance under this act or under

any other act providing financial assistance to foreign countries shall be furnished to such country during the 12-month period following the date of such exportation, or the date on which knowledge thereof is received by the officer or agency administering such assistance, whichever date is later."

Mr. President, I fully recognize that the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has long been concerned with the menace of international communism, and is seeking to meet a problem which does exist in the world today. I would be less than frank if I did not say to the Senate that I have not been satisfied with the attitude of some of our allies and associates who have joined with us in the collective-security system for the preservation of a free world of freemen, and some of those with whom we have dealt with and helped abundantly to rehabilitate themselves from war damage, insofar as they have permitted shipment of materials to the Soviet bloc and the satellite states associated with the Soviet Union.

But, Mr. President, I question very much, as a matter of good legislation, whether the amendment, with all its complexities, and without an adequate chance to have it examined by the proper committee of the Senate, is the way of meeting the problem. I frankly do not know what all the ultimate repercussions of the amendment might be. I recognize that the Battle Act has some loopholes in it. I think it is entirely possible that the Congress, in its judgment, may want to strengthen the provisions of the Battle Act.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the very able Senator from California—and that term is not used lightly when I use it in reference to the Senator from California—that my amendment is very simple. It merely provides that if the United States embargoes certain materials and refuses export licenses for materials which it considers to be of a strategic character, the same rule shall be applied to our allies whom we are subsidizing. In other words, if an American merchant cannot ship machine tools to Russia, my amendment provides that a British merchant cannot ship machine tools to Russia while Britain is getting our aid. If they are not receiving our aid, they can do it. They can choose between the two. They can say, "We will ship war materials to Russia, without receiving American aid," or they can say, "We will not ship strategic war materials, and get American aid."

All I say is that we should apply the same rule to our allies as we apply to the United States. I think that is reasonable. It is pretty hard to get around the reasonableness of it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I think I understand the purpose of the distinguished Senator, but I believe we face a problem when it comes to dealing with sovereign nations with which we are associated. We have laid down certain criteria in the Battle Act. Personally, I think perhaps we have been too lenient in some cases, under some of the provisions of

the act, with respect to what might be shipped to certain countries. At any rate, it is done under a statute which was enacted by the Congress. Perhaps we may have given too much discretion to the President. That is entirely possible.

Perhaps we might be justified, as a matter of policy, in narrowing that field of discretion. But I submit we are beginning to trespass on what is dangerous ground when we say somewhat arbitrarily, perhaps, to a sovereign nation with whom we are affiliated in the free world that she must follow exactly the same list, not as arrived at by negotiation, but as adopted by the American Congress, regardless of whether it was in accord with the legislative intent of the British Parliament or French Parliament or of other nations associated with us—we would tell them that with regard to this question they would have to take our "ticket."

As I said at the beginning, I would be less than frank if I did not say that in times past, under the last administration, and under this administration, we perhaps have not bargained hard enough with our allies to get them to tighten up their lists. Perhaps we should get them to do that. I hope the present administration, indeed any administration, will follow through to see that strategic materials of the type the Senator has mentioned do not go to the Soviet bloc. At the same time, I believe there has been a case made that articles which may appear on the Battle Act list may not be considered by other countries to be strategic, or at least for them they received in return materials which were equally as strategic or more strategic. In that event there may be room for President Eisenhower or any other President of the United States to have discretion in the matter. That is the only point I make to the Senator today.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. Let me say that I have not been blaming the President in this matter. For example, when Mr. Stassen—who had the power to do so—revised the Battle Act list, he submitted a report to the Congress, and I assume he submitted the same report to the President. The McClellan committee, which I think has been doing an outstanding job on this matter, developed the fact that the report was completely false. That being true, the President could not be held responsible for it.

For example, the report—and all this is a matter of record—stated, first, that we were still maintaining an embargo on the shipment of copper. However, we found that 250 million pounds of copper wire used largely for the production of jet planes, were shipped from American mines to Communist Russia, and the transaction was financed by American money. The same is true in the case of railroad tracks, trucks, and other equipment. The committee developed those facts. Many other materials were shipped to Communist Russia; and those materials included aluminum and machine tools—including horizontal and vertical presses—which are used to produce such things as airplane wings.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Let me say that, of course, the Senator from Wisconsin sat in on some of the hearings. All I know is that if a member of my staff gave me a false official report, he would not be a member of my staff 10 minutes thereafter. If an administration official gave me a false report, if I had my way he would no longer retain his job in conducting the affairs of the Government.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes of the time available to me to the Senator from California so that I may ask him another question.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Very well.

Mr. McCARTHY. I should like to point out to the able Senator from California that before the Appropriations Committee we were talking to the man who administers our foreign aid. He is the successor to Harold Stassen. He seems to be a very nice fellow; and he makes the decisions, in large part. I asked him about the shipment to Communist countries of horizontal and vertical drill presses, which perhaps weigh up to 100 tons, and cost up to half a million dollars. I asked him whether he thought it was a great mistake to send those presses to countries which are Communist. Does the Senator from California know what the witness answered? He held his hands about 12 inches apart, and then asked, "What can little presses like that do to help any Communist country?"

The reports which have been submitted are completely inadequate. I should like to ask whether the Senator from California agrees with me that it is a serious mistake for us, who control the pursestrings, indirectly to build up the Communist machine—which is what we do when we appropriate funds to be given to countries which are sending to Communist Russia all the machine tools and other equipment that is necessary for the building up of a war machine. I wish the Senator from California would give some thought to that point.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I have given the matter a considerable amount of thought.

Mr. McCARTHY. Of course I realize that; I meant to say that I wish the Senator from California would give additional thought to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I am not in favor of building up by one iota the war potential of the Communist world. I do not have confidence that the smiles of Khrushchev and Bulganin indicate any long-term change in their strategy. I think their strategy for the destruction of human freedom is the same as was the Communist strategy under Stalin and Lenin. I think Khrushchev and Bulganin are temporarily zigging, instead of zagging; I think a game of musical chairs for power may be going on in the Kremlin. But, inasmuch as Beria dropped out, after someone pulled the chair from under him, it may likewise be that someone will pull the chair from under Khrushchev and then he will find that he has no place to put himself. Nevertheless, in Communist Russia the dictatorship continues and the policy continues; and I see no indication—regardless of the beliefs which may be held elsewhere—that

the Communist tiger has now become a milkfed pussy cat.

THE WHERRY-MALONE JOINT RESOLUTION— PREVENT FINANCING EUROPE'S TRADE WITH COMMUNIST COUNTRIES VERSUS THE BATTLE ACT

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MALONE. Let me say to the distinguished senior Senator from California that around 1949 or 1950 or 1951, when the Senate was debating billions of dollars of foreign aid for European and other countries, the Wherry-Malone joint resolution was passed prohibiting such aid to any country trading with Communist countries. Does the Senator from California remember that resolution?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do.

Mr. MALONE. Immediately after that measure—the Wherry-Malone joint resolution—was passed, the administration rushed in with the so-called Battle Act which the State Department maintained, through a flood of propaganda, was designed to stop aid to such nations trading with foreign countries.

Mr. President, what the Battle Act actually did was to repeal the Wherry-Malone joint resolution to again permit our own taxpayers' money to be paid to foreign countries that were trading and aiding Communist countries.

Whereas the Wherry-Malone joint resolution prohibited such payments giving such countries a choice between receiving aid from us and trading with Communist nations, the Battle Act encouraged foreign aid payments to countries trading with Communist nations purporting to leave the decision to the President. The American people were told through a great flood of propaganda that the Battle Act would stop such payments to countries trading with Communist nations—whereas, as a matter of fact, the Battle Act immediately repealed the Wherry-Malone resolution and encouraged such payments and trade.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That was under the Truman administration.

Mr. MALONE. Yes; but I am discussing the matter now, because it is still the principle that counts and it is worse for us to allow payments of taxpayers' money to countries trading with the Communists because we should know better.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wished to establish the sequence of events.

Mr. MALONE. I realize that.

NATION HAD TO CHOOSE

Inasmuch as the Senator from California remembers the incident, let me point out that under the Wherry-Malone resolution, a nation had to choose between receiving aid from the United States and trading with Communist nations. But immediately the Wherry-Malone joint resolution passed, the Battle Act—which was publicized as one which would stop trading with Communist nations without mentioning that it was already stopped—and actually encouraged such trading to continue; and, as everyone knows, it has continued

from that date to the present time—and is now on the increase.

Last year, I spent 2½ months behind the Iron Curtain; and there it was possible to see the American-made machinery, including lathes, drill presses, machine tools and industrial equipment. Therefore, we see that the Battle Act, as it has been administered, does not prevent our taxpayers' money from going to countries trading with Communist nations.

Mr. President, let me say that I shall vote for the pending amendment because it will again retard the payment of money of the taxpayers of the United States to European or Asiatic nations which engage in trade with Communist nations.

WORLDWIDE SOCIALIST SCHEME

I want to remind the senior Senator from California that I have always opposed the division of the American taxpayers cash and markets with the nations of the world—both constitute a grandiose world Socialist scheme of division of our wealth with the foreign countries of the world.

The 1934 Trade Agreements Act was the beginning of a scheme to substitute foreign cheap labor goods for American-made products thus depriving American investors and workingmen of the American market.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, let me say that certainly the Senator from Nevada has been consistent in his position regarding that matter; and I respect him for his position and his opinions, which he has held for some time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I appreciate that statement by the senior Senator from California.

Let me say that in my opinion it is utterly idiotic to use the American taxpayers' money to build up competition by foreign-produced goods with goods being produced in the United States—which, of course, is what was done under the first Marshall plan in 1948. Under such a procedure, our American markets are dominated by foreign cheap-labor goods—and our wealth is divided through cash outlays.

I shall not go into detail regarding that matter at this time. But I arose to remind this body that through the Wherry-Malone amendment we did make it impossible for American financial aid to be paid to countries which were engaging in trade with Communist countries; and as a result of the Wherry-Malone resolution, foreign countries had to choose between receiving aid from the United States or trading with such areas.

But then the Battle Act was proposed and passed as already described, on the basis of the misrepresentation to the American people that it would prevent such trade.

However, instead of preventing such trade it is now amply demonstrated what we knew would happen, that such trade has been continually on the increase.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his remarks.

At any rate, Mr. President, I think the amendment will have more far-reaching consequences than any Member of the Senate can predict at the present time.

I think it may interrupt a good deal of trade which it would be wise to interrupt, although I fully agree with the Senator from Wisconsin that shipments of vertical and horizontal drill presses and boring machines and copper wire were inexcusable; and if the executive branch of the Government has not made protests against shipments of that sort, I think it obvious that the strongest possible protests regarding such shipments of strategic materials should have been made, and should have been followed up, by the executive branch of the Government of the United States. Despite that fact, I think the Senator's amendment is too far-reaching, and for that reason, at least, I cannot support it.

Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I am troubled by certain features of the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, although I find myself in sympathy with what he is driving at. We would all be most reluctant to do anything to aid Red China. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin provides that in any case in which any foreign country exports to the Soviet Union or any of its satellites, including Communist China, North Korea, and Communist North Indochina, articles the shipment of which to the Soviet Union is embargoed by the United States, no assistance may be furnished to such country under this act. My feelings toward Communist China are well known. Our regulations definitely embargo anything going to Communist China. We forbid the shipment of any item to Communist China.

The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin would have the effect of forbidding any country from receiving our aid if it shipped anything—even baby powder—to Communist China. That means that we might as well give up our entire aid program.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think the Senator has misread the amendment. It provides for discontinuance of aid if a country ships any material which is embargoed by the United States. In other words, I would apply the same rule to our allies that we apply to our own merchants.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. We embargo everything to Communist China. We do not ship anything to Communist China.

Mr. McCARTHY. We do not ship to Communist China. However, we do ship some materials to the satellite nations.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is true. Anything that is shipped to Communist China by any of the countries receiving our assistance would be covered. They could not ship anything to Communist China.

Mr. McCARTHY. I have an amendment in regard to Communist China, which provides that so long as they hold American prisoners—

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That is a different subject.

Mr. McCARTHY. No aid can be given by us to anyone who ships anything to Communist China. According to the testimony before the investigating

committee, the Chinese Reds still have 450 of our uniformed men as prisoners.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I am aware of that, and we are terribly troubled by that situation. But we are discussing the particular amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin, which provides that if any country ships anything to Communist China, aid will be cut off.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will yield 3 additional minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I took some of the time of the Senator from New Jersey. I shall be glad to yield him time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Let me say a word about the Battle Act to try to clarify our thinking.

The Battle Act is designed to allow trade with the Soviet Union in those cases where trade helps our allies more than it helps the Soviet Union. If one of our allies ships a small amount of goods to the Soviet Union—not a shipment of arms but a shipment of something which is regarded as strategic under the Battle Act—and if that country gets back something from the Soviet bloc of higher strategic value such as manganese or other valuable minerals it is the policy of the Battle Act that the President should be permitted to weigh the relative advantages to the free world of such trade and to cut off aid if the net advantage is to the Soviet bloc.

East-West trade controls depend on cooperation of our allies. Without such cooperation there can be no effective controls. If the President has no discretion to negotiate with our allies on such controls there will be no controls. This amendment would undoubtedly result in a great deal less effective East-West trade control than we have under the present Battle Act.

This amendment would result in less effective East-West trade control than we have under the present Battle Act. As I said before, if we forbid anything going to Communist China, it means that under the Senator's amendment every one of our allies with which we are now dealing will be cut off, and we might as well not have any Mutual Security Act at all. So I feel that I must oppose the amendment, although I am entirely in sympathy with what the Senator from Wisconsin is driving at. We must protect ourselves from the building up of Communist China while she is in her present frame of mind, and we must prevent strategic war materials from getting into certain areas.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes.

I should like to say one thing in connection with the statement by the Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND]. The last time he and I differed on the floor of the Senate I read in the newspapers the next day that he and I had a fight. I wish to make it clear that there is no Senator whom I admire more than I do the Senator from California. While I differ with him vigorously, I think he is one of our most outstanding

Senators, and I hope no one will refer to this difference as a fight.

Let me say to the able Senator from New Jersey that my amendment would prevent any of our allies from shipping to Communist China any material which we think our merchants are not entitled to ship to China. It would merely lay down the same rule for the people who are subsidized and supported by us as we lay down for our merchants in the United States. If it is sound for us to follow that rule, I maintain that it is sound for us not to support a nation which ships what we call strategic materials to Communist countries.

While the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] was conducting an investigation into the shipment of materials to China, the Secretary of Defense wrote a letter stating that any material shipped to Communist China, regardless of what it was, increased her war potential. I do not think we should be indirectly helping Red China, while she is holding 450 of our uniformed men. That is a subject on which I feel very strongly.

There was a time when every uniformed man who was sent overseas from the United States carried all the prestige and power of this country on his shoulders. Now we not only abandon them, but we indirectly support the economy and the military might of the country which is holding them prisoner.

When the Senator from New Jersey says that this amendment would prevent the shipment of anything to Red China, he is correct. As to the other satellite countries, I would apply only the rules which apply to ourselves. For example, we are shipping a great amount of goods to Yugoslavia. I would not prevent our allies from shipping the same type of material there; but when we say that something is a strategic war material, we should not indirectly furnish it to our potential enemies.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. McCARTHY. I will yield 1 more minute to myself. I am completely in sympathy with, and wholeheartedly approve some of the things which would be accomplished by the mutual aid bill—for example, military aid to Formosa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. That might be cut off, under the Senator's amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I favor aid to Pakistan and South Vietnam. If we continue to give aid to Yugoslavia, when Yugoslavia says it favors Leninism—which, as the Senator knows, would mean the destruction of the United States and Great Britain by violent revolution—and if we continue to give aid to allies who are shipping war materials to the Communist bloc, I cannot conceivably, in good conscience, vote for the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President—

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I took some of the Senator's time. If he would like additional time, I will yield to him.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Will the Senator yield 2 minutes to me?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. The Senator spoke of strategic materials. The United States embargoes the shipment of everything to Red China. The Senator's amendment provides that if any other country sends anything in there which we have embargoed, there will be no aid. That means that we might be forced to cut off aid to Korea, Formosa, and Vietnam. We would have to cut off aid all over the world.

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Has the Senator examined the situation?

Mr. McCARTHY. We are talking about aid to Communist countries, not aid to South Korea, Vietnam, and Formosa. The amendment provides that when subsidized countries ship to Communist countries goods which we have embargoed, so far as America is concerned, they will not receive American dollars. The amendment has nothing to do with shipments to South Korea, Vietnam, Pakistan, or Formosa.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. It would affect any country where anything may be getting through to Communist China, as I understand.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me a few minutes?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly. How much time does the Senator wish? How much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has 9 minutes remaining.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will need only a few minutes.

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I shall probably not need all of it. While I have not had an opportunity to study thoroughly the amendment, but only to glance at it, from a technical aspect, and therefore I am not quite sure just what the amendment would do, I know that the adoption of the amendment would clearly indicate the sentiment of the Senate, that we are opposed to the inconsistent position we are in today of providing troops and military aid to countries which are our allies, but who in turn are aiding the enemy by selling and shipping to the enemy strategic materials which are essential to the enemy's war effort and the enemy's objective of world conquest. It is an inconsistent position in which we find ourselves. If the amendment is adopted, the conferees can do the technical work which may be necessary to be done. However, a vote for it now and the adoption of the amendment will serve notice that the elected representatives of the people of this country are tired of this duplicity, and want to put an end to it.

I cannot conceive that we owe any obligation of aid, either economic or military, to any country which engages in the sale of war material or the essentials which are required in the building of a war machine against the very nations we are endeavoring to fortify to resist the enemy. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, may I ask some questions for information about this proposal?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Perhaps early in the debate the question I am about to ask was answered. If so, I still hope the Senator will enlighten me. Is there a list in existence or any record or information as to the countries which are receiving aid under the mutual security program from the United States that are shipping to Communist China materials which are classified as strategic materials?

Mr. McCARTHY. I would not say that there is in existence any detailed list, except that the Commerce Department and the State Department apparently have information which we have difficulty getting from them. The McClellan subcommittee has had difficulty in trying to get that information. However, it was freely admitted that they knew what was being shipped.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. There is certainly a movement underway and pressure is being applied to relax controls on Red China, so that Red China may receive from our allies the same strategic materials which are now being sold to the Communist bloc countries of Europe.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is certainly correct about that.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Is there any place where there has been made available reliable information as to which countries are engaging in the trade of strategic materials with Red China?

Mr. McCARTHY. Oh, yes; our committee developed that rather thoroughly. It is all in the evidence. I cannot call on my memory for a particular list. Great Britain has been shipping such material. France has been shipping such material. I believe the United Kingdom is the greatest offender in that regard. Many other NATO countries have done so. I would not wish to rely on my memory for that information.

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin if the evidence of technical experts before the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations did not disclose that a number of nations to which we are furnishing aid, so as to make them militarily strong for the purpose of offering a common defense with us against the Soviet bloc, are sending to the Soviet bloc machine tools which are used for the manufacture of munitions and airplanes and all kinds of weapons? Furthermore, did not those witnesses in some instances testify that it would be better, perhaps, for us to ship the munitions to the Soviet bloc countries, instead of sending them the tools with which they can multiply beyond measure their munitions.

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is correct. One of the witnesses from the Pentagon, I believe, testified that—and I can quote his testimony almost ver-

batim—if we sent ammunition, the ammunition could be used only once; but, if we shipped them machine tools, they could manufacture munitions ad infinitum.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield 1 minute?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I have checked with the staff of the committee, and the latest information we have regarding that trade with Red China from the western countries is one million tons a month. That tonnage goes into Red China's ports. More than 500,000 tons of that material comes from Great Britain. About 75 percent of the vessels going into Red China ports fly western flags, so to speak.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. McCARTHY. I shall yield in a moment. Before I yield I should like to say that I believe the Senate owes an enormous debt of gratitude to the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and to the staff of the subcommittee, particularly Mr. Kennedy, for the extremely efficient and detailed work the staff has done in digging out this information.

I now yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I will ask the Senator if our officials of Government, notably those from the Commerce Department, did not testify before the subcommittee that our allies who are getting aid from us are sending to the Soviet bloc countries materials and machine tools which our own Commerce Department embargoes and forbids American manufacturers to ship to Red China, on the ground that it is necessary to restrict such shipments in the interests of national security?

Mr. McCARTHY. The Senator is absolutely correct. We have embargoed such shipments because it would endanger our national security if those materials were shipped to Red China. On the other hand those materials may be shipped to Communist bloc countries by our allies. I believe it was in August 1954, when Mr. Stassen went to the Cocom meeting and there agreed that these strategic materials could be shipped to all countries receiving our aid.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. McCARTHY. Certainly.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am trying to recall an item which appeared in the press, to the effect that Under Secretary of State Herbert Hoover made the statement that there was a certain amount of trade going on between Formosa and Communist China. Can the Senator give us information on that point? I do not recall the details.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I recall—and this is a matter of record, although I do not remember it was said in executive session or in an open hearing—Mr. Hoover made such a statement one day, but he returned the next day, and when he was questioned about it, he retracted the statement. He retracted it. He said he had been mistaken. He was very frank about it.

Mr. PASTORE. Will a Senator yield some time to me so that I may ask a question of the distinguished minority leader on this point?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield such time to the Senator as he may require for that purpose.

Mr. PASTORE. What is bothering me at this point is the very serious implications with which we are confronted. I should like to address a question to the minority leader, because he is the representative of the administration in the Senate. In view of these implications, can the minority leader tell us—and I am not trying to be facetious or impertinent—whether the President of the United States is for or against this amendment?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I can say to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island that the administration is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. PASTORE. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARTHY. I did not hear the Senator's reply.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I said the administration is opposed to the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. I may say to the Senator from California that the administration unfortunately has completely ignored the disturbing information brought out by the McClellan Committee and has paid no attention to it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say to the Senator that I do not believe that statement is entirely accurate. I am not a member of the McClellan committee, but I have followed its proceedings very carefully in the newspapers and I have the highest regard for the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and for the other members of the committee. I was greatly disturbed by some of the information brought to my attention relative to the shipment of copper and machine tools. I called on the highest levels of the Government, and it is still a matter which is having my personal attention. I am entirely dissatisfied with the things that some of our allies did, and I shall urge to the utmost of my ability, at least, that the strongest representations be made to prevent a repetition.

Mr. McCARTHY. I know the Senator from California is concerned about this problem, and I know he has been following it, but unfortunately nothing has ever been done about it. We have talked to officials of the executive department and have found that they know nothing about the testimony before the committee. The shipment of a horizontal drill press seems not to be important, but someone has to decide whether these things are strategic materials. They simply have not been following the testimony. They have been doing nothing. We talk to them, and they say, "We are concerned about it."

But here is an opportunity for the Congress to say that it shall end, that we will not finance the Communist war machine. There is no way on God's earth we can prove anything other than that we are building the Communist war machine. I think we should step in and call a halt, once and for all.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator's amendment will not solve the problem.

The Senator himself has pointed out—and I have to take his word for it, and I do—that apparently one of the chief offenders has been Great Britain.

Mr. McCARTHY. That is correct.

Mr. KNOWLAND. There have been times when the United States has made very considerable advances to Great Britain, for instance, the British-American loan. I remember when I first came to the Senate, in 1945 or 1946, that was an issue. But at the present time Great Britain is not receiving economic aid or military aid. It is true that we have certain bases in Great Britain, but they do not constitute a part of our mutual defense program which is contained in this bill. We cannot solve the problem, so far as Great Britain is concerned, with this amendment. Perhaps if this step had been taken in 1945 the situation would be different. The statement was made on the floor by either the distinguished Senator from Arkansas or the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that about 40 percent of the tonnage to Communist China was shipped in British bottoms. The problem will not be solved by this amendment.

I do not know whether the facts show what, if anything, Canada is shipping to Communist countries. Canada is not receiving aid from us. We have close relations with Canada and we have some bases in Canada. The adoption of this amendment would cut off all discretion on the part of the President of the United States. If the decision were mine, there would be no doubt in my mind about it, but the decision is not mine to make. There may be shipments of certain things which might be termed strategic materials in return for which the President, in his discretion, might feel we were getting back strategic materials of greater importance to the free world.

Mr. McCARTHY. I am relying on memory, now, but I am positive it is correct that we have received no evidence of any strategic materials flowing the other way.

I wonder if the Senator from California will not agree with the able Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] that this amendment should go to conference. If it is not technically adequate, and it needs to be modified, that can be done in conference. I assume the able Senator from Georgia and the able minority leader will be among the conferees on the part of the Senate and they will have all the power they need to modify the amendment and change it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has 6 minutes remaining. The Senator from Wisconsin has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Why would it not be possible and advisable for the United States to ship behind the Iron Curtain the same things we approve our allies shipping behind said curtain? Evidence before the Government Operations Committee was conclusive that modern ma-

chine tools were being shipped from European countries to the Communists, and that the Russians were paying for them in such commodities as butter and wheat.

If we allow our allies to ship these goods, and at the same time we prohibit our own manufacturers from shipping to the countries in question, what we are really doing is providing foreign aid in blanket fashion, without the matter ever coming to the Congress.

Mr. KNOWLAND. The Senator has raised a very interesting point, a legal point and an economic point. I do not know that two wrongs can make a right, and that if our allies are getting away with it we can be getting away with it too. If our allies are being strengthened, we are doubly strengthening them.

In 1941 I was a newspaperman on the west coast, and I remember writing several editorials protesting shipments of scrap iron and oil to Japan practically up to the eve of Pearl Harbor. I thought that was a bad thing. I do not know whether we should compound the situation, so to speak, open our doors and send to Communist countries machine tools, vertical boring machines, and so forth. I admit that from an economic point of view, it does not make very much sense to foreclose the United States from that market while other nations are taking full advantage of the situation. It seems to me that is something which should be decided in the highest levels of the Government. In some very hard bargaining with our allies we should say, "Look. Either we are faced with a situation of danger to the free world, or there is no danger to the free world. If there is danger, we are prepared to continue certain obligations under our mutual defense system and our collective security system. If there is real danger to the free world you should cease this trade. We expect you to cease it, and we expect you to do so now."

If the distinguished Senator from Missouri ever has the responsibilities of a high office I hope he will make that perfectly clear. I hope that our administration will make it perfectly clear. Whether there is a Republican or a Democrat in the White House, I hope he will make it clear. But regardless of whether the President in the White House is a Democrat or a Republican, we have to have some confidence in the man who occupies that position. I think he must have some discretion. World conditions change almost from day to day. I am concerned that the amendment which the Senator from Wisconsin has offered would tie the hands of the President completely in a situation which I think might be very detrimental, and it might not solve the problem with which we are all concerned.

Mr. SYMINGTON. My difference with the learned and excellent presentation the distinguished minority leader has just made is that the facts as developed by the Government Operations Committee, under the chairmanship of the able senior Senator from Arkansas, prove that, over a period of years, all this administration has done, and by careful planning on their part, has been to make it easier instead of harder for our allies to

ship more and more strategic materials behind the Iron Curtain.

The more I listen to this foreign aid bill, the more I am convinced that what we are doing is giving a blank check to this administration. It would appear that under no circumstances do we want to criticize the activities of this administration in the field of foreign aid. The worst justification, or rather the worst effort toward any justification of a program that I have seen, is the effort, on the part of those in this administration who are handling this money, to justify agreements made with our allies in Paris and in this country to the effect that it is right for other countries in the free world to ship hundreds of millions of dollars of material behind the Iron Curtain, but at the same time saying it was and is improper for American companies to follow the same policy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I thank the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Montana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I thought he had consumed his time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wanted to ask the minority leader, upon looking over the amendment, if it is true that the Japanese are carrying on commercial intercourse with Communist China today, and have carried it on during the Korean war, and that, therefore, the amendment would affect trade which, I understand, has been in progress since General MacArthur's time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not have any firsthand information on that point. That may or may not be an accurate statement. I think some trade has been going on.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In nonstrategic goods.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In nonstrategic goods. I doubt very much whether that trade has included any strategic materials, though persons may differ as to what items belong in a list of strategic materials.

During the Korean war, when the question of British trade came up, I suggested to the administration, and to the previous administration as well, that what we should do, when the British asked what should comprise a strategic list, was to say, "Let us take the British orders in council against imperial Germany in 1914. We will be satisfied with that."

Everything down to a stick of chewing gum was on that list, because it was felt that anything which built up the morale of imperial Germany helped the German war effort.

Mr. McCARTHY. I wish to call to the attention of the Senator from California what I think was a slight mistake in his statement that Great Britain was getting no aid from us. It is true that the bill does not provide any new aid; but it is also true that there is a very sizable amount of money which has been carried over from previous years, much of it un-

obligated, which is available to Great Britain. I simply wanted to correct the Senator's statement to that extent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wisconsin has expired.

All time on the amendment having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS] would vote "nay."

If present and voting, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Indiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay."

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 60, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barrett	Bridges	Curtis
Bible	Butler	Dworshak
Bricker	Chavez	Ellender

Ervin	Langer	Welker
Frear	Malone	Williams
Goldwater	McCarthy	Wofford
Hruska	McClellan	Young
Johnston, S. C.	Symington	

NAYS—60

Aiken	Hayden	Monroney
Allott	Hennings	Morse
Anderson	Hickenlooper	Mundt
Beall	Hill	Murray
Bender	Holland	Neuberger
Bennett	Humphrey,	Pastore
Bush	Minn.	Payne
Byrd	Ives	Potter
Case, N. J.	Jackson	Purtell
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Cotton	Kennedy	Scott
Dirksen	Kerr	Smathers
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Duff	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Eastland	Lehman	Sparkman
Flanders	Long	Stennis
Fulbright	Mansfield	Thye
George	Martin, Pa.	Watkins
Gore	McNamara	
Green	Mullikin	

NOT VOTING—13

Capehart	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Carlson	Laird	Russell
Daniel	Magnuson	Schoepel
Humphreys,	Martin, Iowa	Wiley
Ky.	Neely	

So Mr. McCARTHY's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF MEMORIAL TRIBUTES TO THE LATE SENATOR BARKLEY AND THE LATE SENATOR KILGORE

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield myself half a minute on the bill.

For the information of the Senate and of all other interested persons, I wish to announce that on Monday, July 9, 1956, the Senate will hold memorial services at which tributes will be paid to the late Senator Alben W. Barkley and the late Senator Harley M. Kilgore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. Dawson of Illinois, Mr. Jones of Alabama, Mr. Kilgore, Mr. Brown of Ohio, and Mr. Jonas of North Carolina were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the

Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; and

H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

MUTUAL SECURITY ACT OF 1956

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11356) to further amend the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief announcement. I understand that there are still several amendments at the desk. Some of them will be consolidated, and some of them are duplicates. In the event we are able to restrict our discussion of the amendments, and not use all the available time, we may be able to complete action on the bill this evening.

A number of Senators are very anxious to have that done. Many Senators have speaking engagements which will require that they be out of town over the weekend.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that Senators who are to speak on the remaining amendments will make their remarks as brief as possible; and that Senators who have amendments which have been printed, but which they do not wish to call up, will so advise me, in order that we can make our plans accordingly.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I call up my amendment identified as "6-28-56-H," and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 55, after line 16, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 14. It is the sense of Congress that in the preparation of the fiscal year 1958 mutual-security program, the President should take more fully into account the desirability of affirmatively promoting the economic development of underdeveloped countries, both as a means of effectively counteracting the increased political and economic emphasis of Soviet foreign policy and as a means of promoting fundamental American foreign policy objectives of political and economic self-determination and independence.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I should like to address the Senate on the highly important subject of our national security in the perspective of our pending business, the mutual-security program.

The heavy emphasis and primary importance that we place on the defense and security of our Nation will never be subject to serious debate. But the specific policies and methods which we use to pursue these goals are open to serious question. I am convinced that it is entirely in the best interests of our Nation that those methods should be continually reexamined with a view to their improvement. Undoubtedly one of the major questions in planning an effective foreign-aid program concerns the amount of funds which we should allocate to the economic phase of our total

mutual-security effort, especially in view of the current changes in Soviet policy.

Mr. President, it has seemed painfully obvious to many of us for some time that a reexamination was in order of the military versus economic aspects of our foreign-aid program. Russia's recent shift in tactics in adopting an extensive program of economic and technical assistance has accelerated my concern that we here in the United States can no longer afford to continue complacently with our previous foreign-aid program as a model for our present requirements. As the Senate knows, the Senate Foreign Relations Committee held exhaustive hearings investigating all facets of this program with testimony from scores of administration witnesses. Yet, Mr. President, time after time when Senators have queried the officials in charge of formulating and implementing our foreign-aid policy as to the administration's plans for counteracting this new Soviet challenge, these officials have not been able to delineate any positive, new steps undertaken or even contemplated in the requests for fiscal 1957.

A couple of examples will suffice. On May 14, 1956, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford testified before our committee. The question of areas of relative deficiency in our foreign policy became a subject of discussion. In answer to a question from me, the admiral responded:

I notice that in the NATO meetings of military men there is no disagreement as to the problems that the military face. It is at the political level that there are some difficulties.

I then asked:

And it is therefore at that level that great attention needs to be concentrated?

The admiral answered, "Yes."

Following an exchange of opinion on the entire world situation, I rephrased my question to the admiral.

In other words, we are at a better stage militarily than we are politically; is that what you would say?

The admiral responded:

I would say that our problems in the other fields are greater and more difficult than they are in the military field.

When we consider the "other fields," Mr. President, the whole economic and technical assistance area is obviously of considerable importance. Yet when the ICA Administrator, Mr. Hollister, appeared before the Subcommittee on Technical Assistance Programs on January 23, 1956, he indicated quite frankly that many "attractive" requests for assistance presented to the ICA had been rejected by him largely for budgetary reasons. An effort was made by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee to discover the essential facts about Mr. Hollister's rejected programs and projects. I myself felt that these rejected proposals should have been carefully considered as a part of an overall study of the future of our economic assistance to underdeveloped countries. I regret to say that the information made available by Mr. Hollister on his rejected requests, including information covering the whole field of guidelines

or technical assistance program recommendations, was most discouraging.

Mr. President, it seems to me on the basis of the material made available to us from the ICA that there are three significant conclusions to be drawn:

First, contrary to the practice in previous years, the fiscal year 1957 non-military aid program started with a fiscal target set by the Bureau of the Budget and worked backward to formulate an aid program. My impression is that in other years the assistance requirements were worked out first and then adjusted in accordance with fiscal considerations.

Second, due to the restrictive guidelines and instructions sent to the field, the field felt constrained to stick closely to the planning figures supplied from Washington.

Third, the documents made available to us by the administration indicate that the responsible administration officials, regardless of what they occasionally say, actually do not appear to recognize that a very significant change in Soviet tactics has taken place. Such an awareness has definitely not been reflected in the guidelines sent out by the ICA Administrator to the field. There is no sense of urgency on the part of the administration in the economic and technical assistance aspects of the foreign aid bill. I have found little appreciation or even discussion of the significance of the new Soviet challenge in this area. My impression is that men like Mr. Hollister are drifting along inwardly hoping that the need for the foreign aid program will wither away. This is the only conclusion that can be reached from an intensive examination of administration requests. The same conclusion is obvious from a mere superficial examination of these requests, since they seem in most respects to be a warmed-over hash of previous programs.

We worked long and hard over this complex, and often confused, bill in our Foreign Relations Committee sessions, and I think that after weighing all the various pros and cons, the committee took the action which we believed to be in the best interests of the Nation, even though there were many parts of the measure to which some of us could not give wholehearted support.

Yet, Mr. President, I submit that it is not very comforting to spend \$4.5 billion a year for a policy which shows no more imaginativeness, resiliency, or adaptability than the requests presented to us by the administration. We are voting partly on faith. Let no one mistake my words here: I am most certainly not opposed to the necessary expenditures for an adequate foreign policy, but I can see no reason for being satisfied with a program which does nothing to meet the obviously new and different threat of Soviet economic penetration.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope that for the security and long-run well-being of our Nation, the Russian approach to foreign aid will at long last wake up those in the administration responsible for formulating our own policy. It is about time that the administration was prodded into doing some reevaluating of our foreign-aid program, not merely paying lip

service to such an idea. The world does not always behave the way the words behave, even the words of high administration spokesmen.

Mr. President, on this issue as on others, the press of the country is away ahead of the administration. Typical of many intelligent criticisms of the relatively obsolete mutual-security program presented to us this year is an editorial in the June 21 issue of the Minneapolis Star. Entitled "Emphasis in Aid," the editorial states that "a good many Americans are worried about the apparent impact of Russia's relatively new foreign-aid program in comparison with that of the United States." Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this excellent summary of our present foreign-aid predicament be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPHASIS IN AID

A good many Americans are worried about the apparent impact of Russia's relatively new foreign-aid program in comparison with that of the United States. And rightly so.

It does little good to complain that with comparatively small grants the Russians get more publicity and apparent goodwill than this country reaps with a much larger aid program. For there are other reasons for this disparity of impact than the Soviets' shrewd choice of showcase aid projects.

One reason can be discovered by examining the overall United States foreign-aid program. Although its emphasis ought to have been made plain by the current congressional debate on the program, few Americans realize that at least 89 percent of United States foreign-aid spending is for military or military-support projects.

Russia's foreign-aid venture, on the other hand, however small it may be in comparison with the overall (military included) United States program, is tilted in exactly the opposite direction. Its emphasis is almost all on economic aid.

Keeping these facts in mind might help us appreciate how it is that some young nations overseas, comparing the Russian and American programs in what they consider an objective light, can arrive at judgments which are not favorable to us.

Hardly even the most all-out partisan of greatly expanded United States economic aid, however, would have us drop our military guard. The Communist bloc's past deeds and its still great military potential would make such action foolhardy.

But all things considered, an increasing number of people are beginning to think that if we maintain our own military strength, perhaps even if necessary stepping up slightly our own defense spending, we should be able to work a major shift in emphasis in our foreign aid, from the military to the economic.

Except in a surprisingly few isolated spots in the world, today's militarily oriented program is not producing the dividends (in terms of United States national security) it ought to produce. A major change in emphasis might work for our big program even better than it has for Russia's comparatively smaller effort.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, this editorial suggests that it is high time that a major shift in emphasis from military to economic aid should be seriously considered. This is a view which is not held alone by the Minneapolis Star and Tribune. Verbally it is a view espoused by President Eisenhower not long ago when he said

that every dollar spent on economic aid was in his opinion worth five dollars spent on the military aspects of defense. I do not quarrel with the military appropriations, Mr. President, but I look in vain for anything like President Eisenhower's ratio of economic versus military importance in the foreign-aid requests.

Mr. President, instead the administration sent us a program which calls for a \$2.1 billion increase in military assistance while the amounts requested for economic aid remained for all practical purposes at last year's levels. According to the Secretary of State, the requests consist of 83 percent for military assistance and only 17 percent for economic aid.

At the same time, Mr. President, the indecision and the confusion within the Administration on our technical assistance program and on use of United Nations agencies has been demonstrated by the open split between President Eisenhower and Ambassador Lodge over funneling more technical assistance through the U. N. Ambassador Lodge favors increased use of the U. N. agencies. The President does not feel this is practical.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a press release issued by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States representative to the United Nations, in which Mr. Lodge emphasizes that multilateral aid offers a way to prevent so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. to see which will spend the most in underdeveloped countries.

He also points out that we need bilateral and multilateral programs, but that the present world situation is one which requires our giving new emphasis to multilateral programs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire press release be printed at this point in the RECORD, together with an article entitled "President Is Cool To Funneling Aid Through the U. N." written by Elie Abel, and published in the New York Times of May 4, 1956. The article indicates the President's reaction to the multilateral approach to economic aid.

There being no objection, the press release and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, New York, N. Y., April 30, 1956.

STATEMENT BY AMBASSADOR HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVE TO THE UNITED NATIONS, ON MULTILATERAL ASSISTANCE

The seeds of international communism fall on fertile ground when impoverished peoples see no hope. A hungry man, therefore, is more interested in four sandwiches than he is in four freedoms. But people who are healthy and have enough to eat will be strong enough to fight for themselves against aggression from without or within. This is one important reason why the United States supports programs for economic aid abroad.

A program to which many nations contribute under the auspices of the United Nations has some real advantages over a program sponsored by the United States

alone. That is the difference between so-called multilateral aid and bilateral aid.

Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

A multilateral program supplies no cover for engaging in political penetration, which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do. We thus get credit for unselfish motives in contributing to such a fund; yet we can influence it constructively.

The percentage which a country like ours contributes to a multilateral program is less than it would be under a bilateral program because more countries are sharing the expenses.

A multilateral program conducted in full public view by representatives of the United Nations will not be misunderstood by those who benefit from it. United Nations technicians in special uniforms, for example, would find it difficult to engage in surreptitious political activity.

We need both bilateral and multilateral programs. But the present world situation is one which requires our giving new emphasis to multilateral programs. We can do this without any additional expense by diverting a percentage of our foreign-aid funds to multilateral channels.

NOTE.—This statement was made in response to a correspondent's request for Mr. Lodge's views on the value of multilateral assistance in comparison with bilateral.

PRESIDENT IS COOL TO FUNNELING AID THROUGH THE U. N.—SEES THEORETICAL ADVANTAGE, BUT OPPOSES CHANGE NOW ON GROUNDS OF REALITY—CITES WORLD POLI- TICS—BACKS BILATERAL PROCEDURES—ASKS CONGRESS APPROVE HIS 4.9 BILLION REQUEST

(By Elie Abel)

WASHINGTON, May 4.—President Eisenhower made plain today his misgivings about transferring any substantial part of the United States foreign-aid program to the United Nations.

Such a shift has been advocated, with varying degrees of enthusiasm, by Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations; by Adlai E. Stevenson, Democratic presidential aspirant, and by other prominent Americans.

Ambassador Lodge proposed last week that the United States should channel a large part of its foreign aid through the United Nations. Such an arrangement, he declared, would offer "real advantage over a program sponsored by the United States alone."

The Lodge statement, regarded as a bid for the Soviet Union also to use the United Nations as an aid-distribution agency, contended that in this way it might be possible to prevent an East-West contest "as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country."

ACTUALITIES ARE NOTED

Mr. Lodge contended that such an approach would minimize the danger of under-cover political penetration. Others have taken the view that aid dispensed by the United States would be more acceptable to uncommitted countries because it would not put them on one side or the other.

The President said at his news conference this morning that there might be a theoretical advantage in using the United Nations to distribute economic assistance as a means of removing the whole question from the arena of East-West competition.

"But in practice," he added, "we are quite certain that as of today—and you know the character and difficulties of the United Nations as well as I do—you couldn't keep out politics."

For the present, foreign aid must continue to be carried out through bilateral arrange-

ments with other countries or with groups of countries, the President declared.

He noted, however, that the United States had not been deficient in contributing funds for various forms of relief and technical assistance through the United Nations. In the present fiscal year ending June 30, he said, the United States voluntary contributions would amount to \$71 million, far in excess of what anyone else puts in.

The President made a strong plea for congressional approval of his \$4,900,000,000 foreign-aid request, which is now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

"The program as it is now outlined represents to us a minimum that is necessary for the welfare of the United States in the years to come," he declared.

Asked about his meeting on the foreign-aid issue last Monday with congressional leaders of both major parties, the President said they had studied ways and means of setting up a Commission to reexamine the program and to see how it could be improved.

PROGRAMS CALLED MINIMUM

The Commission will report to the White House and Congress before the Presidential inaugural next January 20, General Eisenhower said. He emphasized, however, that the present program represented a minimum and should not be reduced in anticipation of new proposals next year.

President Eisenhower said it was not entirely true that this year's program could be regarded as a stopgap until better methods of meeting the Soviet Union's economic offensive were devised.

He said the administration was constantly trying to improve the foreign-aid program. To this end, the Council on Foreign Economic Policy, headed by Joseph M. Dodge, former Director of the Budget Bureau, has been at work for many months with every kind of expert advice and counsel that we can get together on this thing, the President said.

"We are certain that in this world of today you cannot walk off and abandon your friends . . . and not have something bad happen," he declared.

CRITICS AT HOUSE HEARING

He acknowledged that the current program was not much different than it had been in recent years, except that the administration had now called on Congress to correct certain past weaknesses. The President was alluding to his request for wider Executive discretion in allocating funds.

Meanwhile, critics of the foreign-aid program were appearing before the Foreign Affairs Committee for the first time in the current session of Congress.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I was hopeful that during these deliberations we might have been able to consider as a part of the foreign aid program a wider use of international agencies. What I refer to in particular is America's possible contribution to international economic development under the auspices of the United Nations. Many of us are familiar with the proposal known as SUNFED—the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development. It is still in the planning stage. It needs the United States, to give it impetus, to give it meaning.

The purpose of the United Nations Special Economic Development Fund would be to improve the economic aid program by promoting the construction of such necessities as roads, hospitals, power stations, and other capital projects essential for industrial development.

The program known as SUNFED would be open to any nation or special agency. The nation or agency would

have to be willing to subscribe to the principles and policies of the SUNFED organization.

SUNFED would be directly related to the United Nations technical assistance program and would be in coordination with UNESCO and the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

I have developed a memorandum relative to the background of SUNFED, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (SUNFED)

I. EXPLANATION OF SUNFED

A. Purpose: To improve the economic aid program by establishing an international fund to develop the "infrastructure" sectors of the economies of underdeveloped countries. "Infrastructure" includes basic necessities like roads, hospitals, and power stations, all of which are essential for the further development of industrial potential.

B. Membership: Open to any nation or special agency, not necessarily a member of the United Nations, provided that the nation or agency would be willing to subscribe to the principles and policies of SUNFED, to pledge its contribution to the operational budget of SUNFED, and to pay its share of the administrative budget.

C. Costs: SUNFED advocates anticipate an initial contribution of \$250 million by at least 30 nations or agencies to get SUNFED going. Actually eventual running costs have been estimated as high as \$3 to \$10 billion.

D. Relation to other U. N. agencies: The auguration of this fund would also necessitate an extension of the U. N. technical-aid program, and coordination with UNESCO and the Economic and Social Council.

II. HISTORY OF SUNFED

In 1953, a committee of nine submitted a report ordered by the Secretary General of the United Nations, bearing on the organization of a Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED).

In 1954 and 1955, Belgian banker Raymond Scheyven, former president of the United Nations Economic and Social Council (1953) reported to the 9th and 10th sessions on the continued studies of SUNFED. The report maintained that "any program of economic development, of necessity, contains a proportion of low-yielding and slow-yielding projects which yet are essential preconditions for the high-yielding and rapid-yielding projects."

During 1954 and 1955 the United Nations General Assembly debated the possibility of implementing the suggestions of the committee of nine. Thirty-two nations, mostly have-not nations, have supported the resolution to implement the report, but in 1954 the United States and other have nations vetoed this resolution.

In 1956 the pressures outside the United States of America for going ahead with SUNFED have increased. The administration has remained opposed. (See IV, infra.)

III. THE VALUE OF SUNFED TODAY

A. Cooperation of the United States in connection with SUNFED would reaffirm in the eyes of the world the good faith of the United States in working with the United Nations.

B. Affiliation with an international organization with the purpose of spreading economic aid to the underdeveloped countries would unburden the United States from some of the onerous consequences of bilateral agreements which have often aroused considered distrust and envy.

C. The United States could thereby call the bluff of the Soviet Union which professes to regard the United Nations as a suitable medium for peaceful activities, untainted by political motives.

D. On the international scale it would fill a gap in the present economic and technical aid plans. This desire to develop the "infrastructure" is a new idea politically but a very widely recognized idea among economists. Former plans have been geared to economies already possessing a strong infrastructure.

E. Our reticence to SUNFED permits the Soviet Union to take the initiative and once more outstrip the United States in winning the approval of the neutral and underdeveloped nations.

F. Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., United States Ambassador to the United Nations, has said (statement made on April 30, 1956):

"Multilateral aid offers a way to prevent the so-called auction which some are trying to promote between the United States and the U. S. S. R. as to which will spend the most in an underdeveloped country.

"A multilateral program supplies no cover for engaging in political penetration, which is what the Communists do and which we are unjustly suspected of wanting to do. We thus get credit for unselfish motives in contributing to such a fund; yet we can influence it constructively."

G. SUNFED might assist in improving domestic political conditions in the recipient assisted countries without the customary adverse reaction to bilateral political "strings". As the Scheyven report stated in 1954:

"It might be easier to carry out such structural reforms through an international organization, which is in a better position to spare national susceptibilities. The intervention of any one country in reforms of this nature would be a very difficult matter, as is illustrated by the reactions which have been aroused whenever lending countries have sought to make their investments conditional upon stipulations which the borrowing countries regarded as infringements of their sovereignty."

IV. UNITED STATES POSITION ON SUNFED

A. The administration believes primarily that SUNFED should not be initiated until disarmament has been well advanced and the funds thereby saved could be profitably reinvested in such economic aid.

B. The administration also contends that other countries involved in large military expenditures would be unable to contribute substantially. If the United States were to bear the brunt of the burden, it would be very costly. Moreover, the argument runs, SUNFED would lose its basic and necessary international characteristics.

C. The administration also claims to feel that a disproportionate part of the original investment would be "wasted" in the organization of the administration of the fund, operational costs, overhead, and plant expenditures.

D. The small initial amounts contributed would have to be followed by spiralling amounts later.

E. In reply to Ambassador Lodge's statement urging the extension of United States support and activities within the United Nations, the President said that the expansion of the United Nations technical- and economic-aid program might alleviate the tension of East-West competition over economic aid, in theory. In practice, though, he said, "We are quite certain that as of today—and you know the character and difficulties of the United Nations as well as I do—you couldn't keep out politics." The President implied that the present American contribution of \$71 million to the United Nations was adequate.

F. There is a present schism in the administration position, evidenced in the Lodge-Eisenhower difference of opinion. Also, Francis O. Wilcox, Assistant Secretary

of State, stated on April 10 that there was a need for encouragement for projects like SUNFED. Wilcox suggested the use of the United Nations in such a project, but tempered his statement with an appeal to the go-slow philosophy.

G. One other fear is that the economic policies of the United States in regard to economic aid will be governed by an international bureaucracy.

V. RETIBUTAL TO THE ADMINISTRATION POSITION

A. We should not postpone action until achieving disarmament. Under the present state of tensions, it would be far more advisable to work on the evils of poverty and hunger which are as much ammunition of the Communists as our military policies. It might also be possible that improvement of economic conditions in the underdeveloped countries might improve the chances for disarmament.

B. One of the basic, unexpressed motives behind the administration position is efficiency. As Walter Reuther said, however:

"We can afford to contribute our share of SUNFED's \$250 million—and much more. We have proved we can afford defense expenditures of \$1 billion a week (\$52 billion a year), and at the same time, contribute to SUNFED and invest in other phases of a rounded development program to the extent of billions a year." (Testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.)

C. There are four safeguards protecting the fund from being "raided" by have-not nations who have not contributed an appropriate amount. The SUNFED proposal would provide that:

(1) Membership is on a year-to-year basis, annually renewable or revocable;

(2) The main contributors to the fund would have half the 8 or 12 members of the governing board;

(3) A board member from a country applying for aid would not participate in action on that application;

(4) The Director would cast the deciding vote in the event of a tie (and the United States as the heaviest contributor, in all probability would name the Director).

VI. SUPPORT FOR SUNFED

A. AFL-CIO, UAW: Walter Reuther said in his testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"It is foolish to the point of suicide to put off such economic cooperation until after worldwide disarmament is achieved or even until another study is completed * * *. It is precisely during the period of tension when disarmament is blocked that such positive offensives against poverty and hunger are most needed, most valuable, most powerfully effective in working out of the swamps and jungles of fear and war into the light and confidence needed for peace and disarmament * * *."

"SUNFED is part of a positive peace offensive, a way to get off the dime of military defense and make real for mankind the four freedoms for which World War II was fought and won."

B. Friends Committee on National Legislation.—E. Raymond Wilson before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, May 11, 1956:

"While it is important and imperative to work for universal disarmament under enforceable law, we can't wait for disarmament to undertake a much more adequate economic development program. Technical cooperation programs and economic development must be expanded rapidly, even if there is no political progress toward disarmament. Indeed, the improvement of economic standards may help to decrease tensions, and in turn improve the chances for achieving disarmament."

C. National Farmers Union.—James G. Patton, president, before the Senate Foreign

Relations Subcommittee on Senate Resolutions 85 and 86, May 29, 1956:

"To move in the direction of peace and abundance, we need to open the door to the negotiation and establishment of * * * an International Development Agency such as SUNFED."

D. UAW International relations resolution adopted April 1, 1955, Cleveland, Ohio:

"We strongly urge Congress to approve and provide the \$80 million for the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development (SUNFED) in order to further demonstrate the deep concern of the people of America to take immediate and practical steps toward world peace."

SPECIAL UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

(Report prepared in pursuance of General Assembly Resolution 822 (IX); General Assembly; Official Records, 10th sess.; supplement No. 17 (A/2906), New York, 1955)

CHAPTER II. ROLE OF A SPECIAL FUND IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNDERDEVELOPED COUNTRIES

11. The function of a special fund cannot be that of a vast international charitable organization similar to the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration after the Second World War. There is no question of the free distribution of consumer goods and the underdeveloped countries are not asking for charity. This would not be a lasting and reliable solution of their problems. The only real solution consists in raising their national income, or in other words, in increasing their production. Such an increase in output can be attained only by the improvement of methods of production, requiring both the training of people—to obtain higher technological skill, managerial ability and administrative competence—and the introduction of modern equipment.

Large amounts of capital are needed both for the training of people and for the provision of modern equipment. This capital should, in principle, be derived from savings, if these were not so low in the underdeveloped countries. The economic advancement of any country left to itself depends, in effect, essentially on its domestic resources and on their full and effective utilization. The economically underdeveloped countries, however, are in a difficult position not only because their domestic resources of capital and technological skill have not been fully mobilized, but primarily because these resources are inadequate. The vicious circle for underdeveloped countries is that their savings are low because their incomes are low and their incomes will remain low if more savings are not made available for investment in equipment. Hence, in the absence of a sufficient flow of foreign capital, the underdeveloped countries themselves are not able appreciably to raise their incomes and the disparity in standards of living which now exists between wealthy and poor countries will continue to widen. As we have indicated in the introduction to this report, we must, in order to reduce tension, achieve a certain balance between the standards of living of the various peoples. Wide differences of income between members of the same community contribute to political instability; for that reason, one of the fundamental aims of a policy of international peace, of which the Special Fund will be one of the instruments, should be to reduce the widening gap between standards of living in the various countries.

12. This disparity can be corrected only if the process of development is seen as an international problem requiring a common effort, which implies that the resources of wealthy countries will be used to supplement the savings of underdeveloped areas. Such assistance to the latter would enable them to step up their investment programs, and

the extent to which they will be able to do so is closely related to the form and the amount of foreign assistance which will become available. In this sphere there is a real need for additional financing along lines different from that provided either by private investors or by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. This additional financing should be directed toward providing the underdeveloped countries with what is called the economic-social "infrastructure," on which the apparatus of production proper is based. The "infrastructure" may be defined as the set of basic facilities needed for effective production, such as a minimum of roads, power stations, schools, hospitals, housing, and Government buildings. Experience has shown that it is only when this basis has been established that production can be developed smoothly and that private initiative can play its full part.

This additional financing can be undertaken only by public capital, largely on a grant basis. This is in conformity with national finance policy in almost all countries. Large sums are continually being spent on this type of investment and it frequently happens that one region of a country finances the development of another region, when this is in the common interest. From the international point of view, there is no reason why this transfer should stop at political frontiers. It is here that the special fund would make an indispensable contribution, supplementing that already made by the other institutions working in the international field.¹

13. Distinctions, which are theoretical rather than practical, are normally made between the various types of infrastructure investments; some are social because they provide for the education, health, and welfare of the population;² others are economic because they tend more directly to promote the economic development of a region. Some investment projects are self-liquidating in the sense that they yield a profit to the investor of sufficient size and over a sufficiently short period to be financed by commercial loans or by private capital; others relate to projects which, although non-self-liquidating, nevertheless constitute an indispensable part of the infrastructure. This category includes roads, schools, hospitals, and other facilities which add to the nation's productive potential, but which are not usually operated in such a way as to yield a profit within a reasonably short period.

It would, in our view, be wrong to consider that the essential purpose of the special fund would be to finance social and not economic "infrastructure" investments. In order to promote the development of a country, it may be more immediately necessary to build power stations and railways than schools and hospitals.

It would be equally wrong to consider that the fund's essential mission would be to finance non-self-liquidating investments and not potentially self-liquidating investments. From the general economic point of view, all "infrastructure" investments, whether social or economic, provided that they are not unnecessarily large and that they are integrated in a coherent development program, are directly or indirectly self-liquidating, since they all contribute to the

¹ These transfers should not be confined to relations between industrialized and underdeveloped countries; they are also possible in relations between industrialized countries or between underdeveloped countries themselves.

² In some cases, the most desirable form of development may be dependent on migration. One of the aims of the special fund might therefore be to establish conditions favorable to the transfer and resettlement of surplus population.

short-term or long-term development of the economy. Thus the construction of hospitals and schools will provide a country with a healthier and more highly skilled labor force, which cannot fail to have favorable effects on productivity.

In the financial sense of the term, only self-liquidating investments, i. e., investments which yield a financial return on the capital invested within a reasonable period, can attract private capital or be financed by commercial loans. However, the infrastructure may include normally self-liquidating projects, such as power stations, which cannot be financed either by private capital or commercial loans, owing to the subsequent transfer difficulties which such methods of financing may entail. In this case, one of the functions of the special fund would be to solve these difficulties, either by a grant, or by a loan repayable in local currency, as will be explained in chapter IV of this report.²

To sum up, it would be the function of the special fund to finance any investment whether economic or social, in underdeveloped countries, which was part of a coherent program designed to attain the maximum rise in national income and which could not be fully financed by private capital, the International Bank, or any other loan-making institution.

14. In performing this function, the special fund would be able to initiate or to stimulate development processes that would not otherwise take place. Its action would be comparable to that of the Marshall plan for the rehabilitation of the war-devastated countries of Europe. The success of the European recovery program was complete. It had all the features of the operations outlined above and broke the vicious circle of low production and low investment which threatened Europe as the result of war damage. It consisted mainly of grants, since it was understood that the balance of payments position would not permit the repayment of loans for some years. It enabled the European countries to restore the most essential parts of their production equipment, including roads, electricity plants, and certain buildings. However, so far as the necessary investments were concerned, United States assistance only supplemented the countries' own contributions. The recovery in production and income in the Western European countries has made it clear that these investments were economically sound and that they helped to restore political stability in the countries concerned.

It is true that in the case of Europe, it was a process of reconstruction rather than of development that was envisaged. It is also true that the assistance was limited in time, whereas the development of underdeveloped countries is a long-term undertaking. However, if even in this case it was considered necessary to assist the recovery of produc-

tion in Europe by external aid, such assistance would be all the more necessary for underdeveloped countries. The experience of the Marshall plan has shown the path to follow. In view of the dangers to international political stability involved in the alternative of inaction, it would be most unfortunate not to make use of that experience.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Moreover, Mr. President, other major areas of confusion remain unresolved. Thus, instead of attempting to formulate an approach to the tremendous economic needs of Asia, estimated by such foreign-aid experts as Professors Millikan and Rostow to be as high as \$1.6 billion per year of realistic absorptive capacity, we continue to think largely in terms of planes and tanks which are not necessarily relevant to the Asian situation. In the Indian-Pakistan-Afghanistan area, we are actually upsetting local balances of power.

Another aspect of administration confusion lies in the field of farm surpluses. While many people in the world subsist on starvation diets, the United States has ample supplies of foodstuffs which can be most effectively used in a humanitarian gesture, and in a manner highly valuable to the prestige and respect of the United States abroad. So what does the administration do? It cut back by \$50 million the amount of American agricultural products planned for shipment overseas.

Mr. President, when is the administration going to wake up to see what is going on in the world outside? The administration's complacent point of view has created a program which does not begin to meet some of the most pressing needs of the world and our Nation today. Our leaders have talked about the advantages of economic aid, and yet they have done nothing about it. They have talked about the value of more dramatic contributions to the United Nations, and yet they have done nothing about it. They have talked about the urgency of the economic thirst of Asia, and yet they have done relatively nothing about it. Now, more than ever before, we need bold, thoughtful, and imaginative planning of the money we spend on foreign aid, and the administration plays for us the same old record labeled "we must help our allies," and shows no foresight or even common horse sense in the arrangement of the music. Mr. President, I am impatient with an administration that indulges in such constant window dressing and yet when it comes down to actually doing something concrete with their verbiage, they back down.

Mr. President, this confused administration program has been presented to us even in the face of testimony like that of Walter Reuther, who has just returned from an extensive trip to India and who estimates that an overall economic-aid program of \$8 billion per year would not be exorbitant. Mr. John Cowles, the distinguished president of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune, made a penetrating analysis which was inserted in the RECORD several days ago. He emphasized the urgency of allocating greatly expanded portions of our existing mutual-security funds to economic aid.

Even a casual observer of newspaper headlines would have seen the countless reports and articles which underline the strategic value and need of economic aid. Two articles from the New York Times in relation to the crucially important Asian sector of the globe, for instance, quickly show the shortcomings and failures of our present policy. In the May 26 article entitled "Asian Neutrals Pose Economic-Aid Problem," Mr. Thomas J. Hamilton repeats a common complaint: That no clear indication of our policy has yet come from President Eisenhower or Secretary Dulles toward new developments in Asia. The disturbing cancellation of Prime Minister Nehru's scheduled visit will further postpone such policy considerations.

In an article of April 10, 1956, numerous New York Times foreign correspondents reported a summary of their interviews and observations in many nations. They agreed that good will toward the United States in many strategic Asian nations has been seriously ebbing, and they continue to point out how again and again the problem of economic development is foremost in the minds of our non-Communist friends abroad.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two articles just described be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times of May 26, 1956]
ASIAN NEUTRALS POSE ECONOMIC-AID PROBLEM—THEY WOULD LIKE TO GET ASSISTANCE THROUGH THE U. N. BUT CONGRESS PREFERS BILATERAL APPROACH—SOVIETS ALSO APPEAR COOL

(By Thomas J. Hamilton)

During his state visit, President Sukarno has given the American people a clear exposition of the policy that Indonesia and indeed all the new countries of Asia and Africa are demanding from the West.

For one thing, they expect the United States to back them all the way in their drive to eliminate the remaining vestiges of colonialism from the earth. Although they are neutralists, or, as they prefer to call themselves, "uncommitted," they insist that the descendants of Thomas Jefferson and Patrick Henry must automatically support Indonesia's claim to West New Guinea and India's to Goa.

This argument obviously presents a problem for the United States. The economic phase is equally difficult. Dr. Sukarno has emphasized that the new nations want economic assistance not guns. He did not discuss methods, but Prime Minister Nehru of India, who will be the next Asian leader to visit Washington, has already proclaimed that this help should be provided through the United Nations, not bilaterally.

Dr. Sukarno's visit has developed the point that the new countries are now just as insistent upon American help in developing their economies as they are upon support in their anticolonial offensive. Walter P. Reuther, who has studied the situation in India and other southeast Asian countries, expressed it in his letter to Secretary of State Dulles last March.

FRIENDSHIP'S GAIN

"The hungry, the naked and dispossessed masses are on the march, and they are determined to free themselves from economic bondage, as many have already freed themselves of colonialism and political bondage," Mr. Reuther wrote. "In the long run, we will

² A typical case has been brought to our knowledge. We were informed that a financial institution particularly concerned with assistance to underdeveloped countries had made loans to an Asian country to finance four projects, but had refused to finance a fifth. It was not that the fifth project was less important than the first four or that it was not financially self-liquidating. In both respects it was on the same footing as the other four projects. The institution considered, however, that it could not make the fifth loan because of the economic situation and balance of payments position of the applicant country which would have prevented it from repaying the fifth loan within a reasonable period. The fifth project, although self-liquidating, would be within the province of the special fund, which would finance it either by a grant or, more probably, by a loan repayable in local currency.

gain by making grateful friends, not jealous enemies."

Gifts and loans by Western governments, in particular by the United States, appear to be the only solution that the new countries will accept; in particular, all of them are allergic to allowing private capital to finance them.

Since the Soviet Union has already started to provide limited but spectacular economic help for the new countries—Moscow might do more after it reduces its armed forces—they now seem to have an alternative if the United States does not respond to their appeals.

But there are no signs that Congress, which in an election year is particularly aware of the tax burden, will either increase the foreign-aid appropriation for economic assistance or permit the United Nations to administer it.

President Eisenhower has asked for a foreign-aid appropriation of \$4,900,000,000, of which three-fifths is for military assistance. Another fifth is for economic assistance to countries with which the United States has defense agreements.

This leaves considerably less than \$1 billion for economic assistance to the neutral countries and for contributions to the United Nations and related agencies, including the technical-assistance program. The United Nations program is spending \$28 million this year, of which half was supplied by the United States.

ISSUE OF COMMITMENTS

During the appropriation bill's passage through the House of Representatives in Washington thus far the military program has been cut more heavily than the economic program. But the administration's request for authority to give more than a year's commitment on projects requiring years to complete seems to have been eliminated for good.

Apart from demonstrating the determination of Congress to retain control of the purse strings, the treatment of the bill reflects the strain on the American taxpayer. He has provided billions of dollars in foreign aid since 1947.

Furthermore, since Mr. Dulles has boasted that the revised Soviet tactics resulted from the defeat of Russia's former policy, the sense of urgency about even the military program is diminished. It is even more weakened in the case of economic assistance.

RUSSIA INCLUDED

As far as the United Nations is concerned, a serious drawback is the fact that the Soviet Union is now participating in the U. N. technical-assistance program to the extent of \$1 million worth of nonconvertible rubles a year. While some countries have demurred at admitting Soviet technicians under the U. N. program, Burma has accepted 2 experts on coal-shale mining and India 2 statisticians and a woman physician.

It was, of course, the fear in Washington that the Soviet Union would sabotage the Marshall plan that resulted in the decision to administer it outside the United Nations. Although United Nations authorities say that a \$50-million technical assistance program for next year is the minimum that would take care of meritorious applications, it would be idle to disregard the conviction of many Americans that, if the United States is going to spend the money, it ought to get the credit.

In accordance with this feeling, the United States, in fact, has for years blocked the establishment of SUNFED—the Special United Nations Fund for Economic Development—although it calls for an annual expenditure of only \$250 million a year. The United Nations Atomic Energy Commission is to be established next year on the initiative of the United States. But if the new countries and the Soviet Union insist upon taking

over control, the United States may fall back on its existing bilateral program.

FRENCH PROPOSAL

On the other hand, there is a growing movement, led by France's Foreign Minister Pineau, for the increased use of the United Nations in providing economic assistance. One reason is the technical consideration that experts from less industrialized countries may be more useful—and work for lower cost—than Americans in helping backward countries.

But the basic consideration is the justified belief that the neutralist governments find it easier to accept help from the United Nations than directly from the United States.

The same considerations have applied to bilateral help from the Soviet Union. Judging from the equivocal reaction of the Soviet Union to M. Pineau's proposal, the Presidium apparently is no more enthusiastic about a United Nations program than is Congress.

No clear indication of policy has come from President Eisenhower or Mr. Dulles. However, their representative in the United Nations, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., is insisting that "we need both bilateral and multilateral programs" and that a larger part of the foreign-aid program should be channeled through the United Nations.

[From the New York Times of April 10, 1956]

ASIA SURVEY FINDS NEED OF MORE AID—SOME SEE CUT IN UNITED STATES LIVING STANDARD TO PROVIDE HELP

(By A. M. Rosenthal)

COLOMBO, CEYLON, April 9.—The great challenge—and the great opportunity—facing United States foreign policy is communism's eager pursuit of nationalist movements all over the world.

The challenge springs from the fact that the Russians have grasped the enormous emotional and political drive behind what Asians like to call the age of nationalism.

Not long ago, at one of those earnest diplomatic garden parties that make up a good deal of New Delhi's official social life, an Indian Foreign Office man was talking about a favorite topic—where the United States goes wrong.

"You don't seem to be able to realize that countries see the world in different ways, that problems unimportant to you are primary to us," he said.

"That's why you are finding yourself losing out to the Russians on this colonialism business," he continued. "They have the wit to see that nationalism is the force of this decade. Intellectually you see it, too, certainly. But you expect the impossible. You expect Algerians, for instance, to take a world view, not the Algerian view."

The United States is no longer counted a sure friend of nationalist movements.

This is a bitter thought for the United States, remembering that freedom was given to the Philippines, and help to India and Indonesia. It is made more bitter by the fear that the western age of colonialism is being replaced by Soviet political and military conquests.

But there is no point in giving argument for argument. It is enough that Asians have lost trust.

The national elections in Ceylon, which resulted in a crushing defeat of the openly prowestern government, were fought on domestic rather than international issues. But certainly they showed that being identified with the West has no great political asset to an Asian politician. And they showed, too, that the West's policies had not struck a real spark in the minds of the Ceylonese.

This is a problem made infinitely more acute by the fact that the Russians, with no political commitments to the "colonial" powers, can and do eagerly push themselves

forward as friends of nationalism everywhere.

The opportunity springs from the challenge. It is the opinion of many Asians and some important United States officials in this area that the United States, in its concern for physical and military security, is letting the political battle go by default. They believe too that Americans do not realize that good will toward the United States is ebbing. But they believe that the plain threat that the Communists will be able to identify themselves with nationalism may prod the United States into restating its own traditional friendship for independence movements.

Among some Americans here there is a belief that the best step the United States could take now would be a straight and unequivocal statement of its intention to see that every land capable of self-government attains it.

For the sake of political effect, it might help the United States to bring up the issue itself at the United Nations. It certainly would help if a declaration were made formally by the President of the United States.

This reporter has not heard that last suggestion put in as many words by Indian or United States officials. But there have been many comments that the time has come for clarification of United States policy. Putting that hope together with the fact that President Eisenhower's personal prestige is high here, it is obvious that a Presidential declaration would have more force than any other kind.

ALL CANNOT BE PLEASED

It is the opinion of most westerners in India that for the time being at least the United States cannot evolve a foreign policy that will make New Delhi or all other Asian capitals entirely happy. The reason is in the basic difference in attitude toward the Communist philosophy and toward the danger of that philosophy.

India and other Asian countries are ready to believe the danger of military aggression has passed. As far as the United States is concerned, military containment and preparedness will have to remain the skeletal structure of United States foreign policy. That means something the Indians will never like—military pacts in which their neighbors are armed.

It has to be recognized—and this comes from a number of Asians—that the United States cannot satisfy all Asians' wishes.

But, especially in connection with nationalism, Asians say that Americans must also recognize that they need not keep all their allies happy all the time.

The United States would have to pay a price for meeting the Soviet challenge on nationalism head on—the anger of some United States allies.

But the history of the last 10 years has proved that sooner or later the United States has had to take public stands that its Western allies did not like, and that too often—Cyprus, for instance—those stands were taken too late for maximum political effect. Put another way, opinion in this part of the world is that the time has come for the United States to lead the parade instead of running after the Soviet Union.

The nationalist question cannot, of course, be considered without taking the free world's military security into account. But if the last decade has shown anything—consider Suez, Cyprus, Indochina, and North Africa—it is that military security depends on political security and that democratic countries cannot hold down military bases surrounded by hostile populations.

This is not a suggestion for abandoning military security but for reconsidering the essentials for military security. To give just one example, there are United States military men in Saigon who believed that the pres-

ence of the French Expeditionary Corps in South Vietnam was such a political liability that it amounted to a threat to military security.

And it is being asked whether the British naval base on Cyprus is more secure now than it would have been if the British had given up sovereignty and signed a long-term lease treaty with the willing Greeks.

ECONOMICS AN ESSENTIAL

Some American officials in Asia might disagree with the emphasis on pushing to the front on the colonialism issue. But few would disagree that economics becomes every day a more essential part of our foreign policy. One obvious reason, of course, is that the Russians have entered the picture—in Egypt, India, Syria, Indonesia, Afghanistan, Burma, the Sudan, and Yemen.

But just as important is the fact that the newly independent countries are aware more sharply than ever before of the gap between them and the developed countries. That gap is growing because Western industrialization is outpacing the painful development efforts of Asia and the Middle East.

Sooner or later in a discussion of foreign policy the talk boils down to this: The United States will have to spend still more money and share still more of its wealth with Asia.

What is more, there is a belief among Americans in Asia that the time may be coming when the United States will have to cut down its continually rising standard of living to meet Soviet competition and to help underdeveloped countries get ahead. Indian businessmen say the United States is pricing itself out of the market.

An example among many: The Tata Iron & Steel Co., part of the biggest industrial-commercial enterprise in India, was negotiating with the United States Export-Import Bank for a loan to double its steel producing plant. The negotiations fell through because under a loan, say the Tata spokesmen, the concern would have been obliged to buy all its equipment in the United States and prices were too high, when measured against the high interest rate demanded by the bank.

One of the problems the United States must face in Asia is a drift toward nationalization of economies. Nearly everyone believes it would be unwise and impossible to try to pressure India, for instance, away from socialism.

But among Americans there is the opinion that, without interfering with Asian lands bent on some form of socialism, there is a great deal Washington can do to promote the spirit and philosophy of enlightened private enterprise.

AID TO PRIVATE INDUSTRY

One American businessman said in New Delhi recently that since the United States was willing to give hundreds of millions of dollars to governments, it should be willing to give private Asian industry a hand by making low-interest rate loans. He mentioned the Tata episode as a case in point.

The Tata organization is now negotiating with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a loan. That means the Indian Government would have to stand behind the loan and would have a stronger voice in Tata affairs.

The point this businessman and others made was that where opportunities presented themselves to help reliable private enterprise in Asia, the United States should take them.

High United States prices and interest rates take on political importance because the Soviet Union will make sacrifices to supply goods at prices underdeveloped countries can afford.

There is a feeling among Westerners that sometime soon the people of the United

States may have to learn the painful lesson that continuously rising wages and profits may wreck their country's ability to compete with the Soviet Union in the economic struggle for Asia. Already India is buying most of her cement from Communist countries. Multiply this by a hundred products and the political consequences need no underlining.

The job of strengthening the economic foundations of underdeveloped countries was started by the United States a decade ago. Still the insistence of Western and Asian officials is that more and more money must be appropriated because on this now hangs the future of Asia. Not only more money is needed but more imagination and more planning.

CONFERENCE SUGGESTED

So far, planning and spending have been on a national basis and sometimes without clear goals in mind. There are United States officials here who believe that one of the things the United States could do would be to call a technical level conference to work intensively to map out Asia's needs, resources, foreign aid requirements and attainable objectives. There is a good chance the United States would find itself ahead of the Asian countries in the desire for regional planning, but there is nothing wrong with leading the field.

India needs more money, large quantities of it. If the United States was willing to lend India the money—a billion dollars at least—it could assure that India's own democratic way to a mixture of socialism plus private enterprise had stood the test when compared with Communist China's totalitarian economy.

It is in the interest of the United States to help noncommitted countries, but there is no reason why it should be ashamed of making a special economic effort for its allies—Pakistan, for instance. The recent meeting of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization at Karachi expressed some fond hopes about emphasizing the economic aspects of the alliance. But beyond appointing one economist the conference did nothing about it. Here, too, is a field for United States imagination.

The problem of Afghanistan is one of the most difficult the United States faces. For one thing, the Soviet loan of \$100 million faces Washington with a decision as to whether to be drawn into the endless, sapping process of trying to outbid the Soviet on loans. That is just what leaders of this area think Washington did in the case of the Aswan High Dam in Egypt, and the action did not enhance the reputation of the United States.

But the bigger problem the United States faces in Afghanistan is the same one it must deal with in many countries in Latin America, the Middle East, and Asia. That is whether United States funds are to be used to bolster dictatorial governments just because they happen to be in power.

There is no easy answer to this. The Russians certainly have no compunctions about supporting any government in power so long as it suits their purpose. But whether that approach and that philosophy in the long run suit the objectives of freedom is questioned by many Asian friends of the United States.

Assuredly the United States cannot change the governments of the world to suit itself. But it would be in keeping with United States traditions to make it clear through Presidential statements that Washington is not ready to build up dictatorships of the right in its fight against dictatorships of the left.

The world struggle is as much as anything a struggle for minds and attitudes. And there is something the United States could do that would not cost astronomical sums, would pay off handsomely and would be wel-

comed by most Americans who have spent any time in the area. That would be to step up scholarships for foreign students to study and live in the United States and for Americans to study abroad. This correspondent has met many Asians who have lived in the United States and virtually every one has returned with more understanding and sympathy toward United States goals.

Many Asians feel that knowledge of their lands is almost nonexistent in the United States. An increasing number of Americans living in Asia could do much to remedy that.

It might help prevent incidents like the one involving the Member of the United States Congress interviewed at the Karachi Airport, who was asked what Americans thought about Pakistan.

"Think about it?" he asked. "My boy, they never even heard of it."

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, the administration has now tacitly admitted its confusion, its lack of direction and foresight, by agreeing that a study of our whole program of foreign aid is called for. The Foreign Relations Committee has likewise now endorsed an appropriate resolution to establish a comprehensive, exhaustive study of the entire, complex foreign aid problem.

Of course, studies themselves will not be self-executing. Depending on who conducts them, these studies may not even be new or path-breaking. It is extremely important that we obtain meaningful, useful results without impairing the flexibility or breadth of analysis which the committee wishes to undertake. We should consider carefully what methods of approach should be utilized to make this study most profitable. Already pertinent questions have been included in Senate Resolution 285 introduced by Senator MANSFIELD. Other proposals that might supplement or implement those already suggested could include the following:

First. The National Planning Association might be requested to bring up to date the Paley Commission Report, 1952, to give us a current estimate of projected industrial raw material shortages which will occur in the United States during the next 20 years. We need to consider what kind of foreign economic policy will be necessary if we are to have continued safe access to these indispensable materials from abroad.

Second. I should like to see special economic reports from the Joint Committee on the Economic Report assessing in detail our own national economic interest in a large-scale, long-term aid program. I would like to have similar reports from the President's Council of Economic Advisers, and I would frankly be interested in comparing the recommendations from the Joint Committee and the Council.

Third. I should like to see the Center for International Studies at MIT be charged with the preparation of a new report on the extent and meaning of the Soviet foreign economic drive.

Fourth. I should like to have a special report from the Institute of International Education regarding its own best informed judgment on the kind of people-to-people exchange projects which should accompany an enlarged economic aid program.

Fifth. Finally, I think we need to examine new methods of bridging the gap between official policy and public opinion as a deliberate device for filling in the gap caused by this administration's chronic lack of Presidential and Cabinet level leadership in explaining our foreign aid objectives to the people. Perhaps a commission of prominent citizens, representing leading national organizations of businessmen, labor, farmers, women, veterans, and religious bodies, might serve as a vehicle for a two-way exchange of views between Washington and the country. I would hope that Government observers or participants could play some role in this commission, but they should not direct it. Indeed, I would like to see some of the participants in the recent 1-year foreign aid study conducted by the Committee for Economic Development play a major role in such a commission.

Mr. President, regardless of what elements make up the comprehensive study now proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, it is equally important that we must pay attention to the results of the study. I have already referred several times in the Senate to the excellent and incisive study by Professors Millikan and Rostow, of MIT, recently made available to the members of the Foreign Relations Committee. We now know that this report is an up-to-date version of one originally sent to the ICA, then FOA, in the fall of 1954, where it has been gathering dust ever since. We must do better than this in the future, or no amount of "studying" will be productive of practical results.

I think, Mr. President, that we will find that the results of any dispassionate study will invite us to expand our economic aid abroad as indispensable to our international policy. In the face of the new economic conflict with communism I, for one, feel that it is time to ditch some of the past phraseology and overtones of foreign aid in favor of a bold new concept geared to greater overall economic integration of the free world.

The moment when Russians are turning toward economic expansionism is hardly the time for our foreign economic policies to contract. With half of the world's industrial production, we alone are in a position to render really substantial assistance to underdeveloped parts of the free world—in our own long-term interest. Existence of our so-called food surplus suggests, of course, that our assistance need not be in dollars alone. But against Soviet competition which looks a generation or more ahead, it is simply inadequate for us to rely merely on year-by-year congressional appropriations for foreign aid without some long-term sense of direction and continuity. Reasonable assurances of continued aid are essential if some nations are to mobilize their own funds, enlist public and private investment, and plan ahead intelligently. It is the best way to reassert our world leadership. The administration is underestimating, not overestimating, the challenge. On the economic front, it is asking too little, not too much.

Mr. President, time is not necessarily on our side, and I believe we shall come to regret the lack of planning and foresight which the administration has exhibited in the foreign-aid requests this year. I hope that we can still recapture the initiative and, after this interim of relative paralysis, can strike out in a major new economic effort. We should go into such a program with our eyes open, not expecting to purchase either gratitude or allies. Today every underdeveloped nation is struggling to find the investment needed if its industrial growth is to keep pace with the demands of its impatient people. In Asia probably the greatest economic race of the century is now going on between democratic India and totalitarian China, to see which will accomplish the most in the shortest time.

Into this psychological situation come the smiling Russian rulers, brandishing offers of trade and aid, pointing to the significant Soviet economic advances since 1918, and stating the moral: "Where we were then, you are today; where we are today, you will be tomorrow." The underdeveloped world is increasingly impressed.

It is also increasingly comparing Moscow and Washington. For every American politician or administration personality who complains about neutralism saying "Whoever is not with us is against us," some Politburo member is touring non-Communist Asia saying "Whoever is not against us is with us."

Mr. President, what we must seek is the success and stability of these underdeveloped nations themselves, to give them a vested interest in their own and the free world's defense. The alternative is clear. If the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and even South America, are not able to work out a close economic relationship with us, they will move sooner or later into a close economic relationship with the Soviet Union. That result would be catastrophic—for them, for us, and for the world.

Mr. President, I conclude my remarks on this subject by saying that I hope next year we shall have before us a program which is a little more realistic than the bill we now have. That is the purpose of the amendment I now propose.

With the Soviet Union challenging us on the economic front throughout the world, it appears to me that it is all to our advantage to call the bluff of the Soviet Union in the United Nations, in the international agencies, and everywhere else.

I should like to see the United States Government take the leadership in a program such as SUNFED. I should like to see our Government stake out guidelines and actually call upon the other nations of the world to match the percentage rate of contributions which we make. I think the sooner we do this, the better the program will be.

I am disappointed in the lack of emphasis in the present foreign-aid bill in its economic assistance aspects. The economic aid provided this year is not proportionately more than it was last year. The increase is primarily in military as-

sistance, and military assistance may very well be frittered away.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. If the Senator from Minnesota will simply delete the date 1958 from his amendment—inasmuch as 1958 would be beyond my present term—and if he will insert the words "in the future" or "for the future," and so forth, then insofar as I am concerned, I shall be willing to accept his amendment, because it relates to the question of the policy.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I so modify my amendment, by striking out, in line 2, the words "fiscal year 1958." As thus modified, the first two lines of my amendment will read:

It is the sense of Congress that in the preparation of the mutual security program—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has a right to modify his amendment, and it will be modified accordingly.

Does the Senator from Minnesota yield back the remainder of his time on his amendment?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time available to our side on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota to the committee amendment has been yielded back.

The question is on agreeing to the modified amendment of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] to the committee amendment.

The amendment, as modified, to the committee amendment, was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, to the committee amendment, I offer, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McLELLAN], the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the committee amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 40, in line 25, it is proposed to strike out "section" and insert "sections."

On page 46, between lines 5 and 6, it is proposed to insert the following:

SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Wyoming yield himself on his amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, first let me state that I submit this amendment to the committee amendment on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] and myself. He was kind enough to suggest to me that he would allow me to make a choice between his amendment and mine. It is very difficult to make a choice; the only difference is one of language. However, inasmuch as I am more familiar with the language of my amendment than I am with the language of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, I have offered the amendment which I had presented the day before.

Mr. President, the purpose of this amendment to the committee amendment is to meet the very important question of whether the Congress of the United States is entitled to receive from the officers and employees of the Government information with respect to the duties which the Congress by law imposes upon the executive branch of the Government. There has been a growing practice on the part of executive agencies to hide behind the policy—which was inaugurated early in the Government, by President George Washington—of not disclosing matters which are clearly within the initiative of the President, if he feels that the public interest would thus be jeopardized.

Congress has never undertaken by law to interpret the power of the Executive to withhold information, because in the early days of our Government it was not the practice of the departments to refuse to the Congress of the United States information concerning the general laws which were enacted.

However, as I have stated, in recent years there has been a tendency, as the executive branch of the Government has increased in size, for even subordinate officials to withhold from Congress evidence as to what they were doing with the funds appropriated to their agencies by the Congress.

In an opinion submitted to the House Committee on Government Operations, the Attorney General cited some of the old cases in which the Supreme Court upheld the right of an individual, under the Bill of Rights, to refuse to answer questions irrelevant to investigations which Congress was making. None of those decisions has any application whatsoever to an investigation by Congress of the activities of the executive departments with respect to the duties imposed upon them by law. There is a difference between the right of an individual citizen not to be interrogated by Congress in matters which are protected by the Bill of Rights, and the refusal of an officer of the Government to give the Congress of the United States answers, information, data, and papers which bear upon the execution of the very power provided by the law.

In the opinion by the Attorney General, the case against Mr. Daugherty, a brother of the Attorney General during the administration of Mr. Harding, was

cited, but that case clearly held, when it was finally adjudicated by the Supreme Court, that Congress undoubtedly had the right to obtain information bearing upon legislation and bearing upon the interests of the United States.

The constitutional power of the Congress to appropriate money to the executive department is very clearly stated in the Constitution:

No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in consequence of appropriations made by law; and a regular statement and account of the receipts and expenditures of all public money shall be published from time to time.

Words could not be clearer. The amendment which we offer tonight is clearly within that constitutional power of Congress, clearly within the constitutional provision which was designed to protect the public funds raised by taxation from the people of the United States.

We have before us a bill which authorizes the appropriation to the President of billions of dollars. These funds are so great that it is utterly impossible for the President himself to expend them, so he must recruit a large office force of individuals whose appointments are never confirmed by the Senate or by the Congress, and who are never known by the Congress. So we propose to insert in the bill a new section, on page 46, between lines 5 and 6. Let me read it again:

SEC. 538. Furnishing of information to congressional committees: Upon the request of any appropriate committee of the Senate or House of Representatives, any joint committee of the two Houses, or any subcommittee of any such committee, any officer or employee of the Government having information, or having custody of documents or other data, relating to the programs being administered under this act, shall promptly furnish any such information, documents, or other data to such committee or subcommittee.

The Foreign Relations Committee, through its chairman, has announced upon this floor its purpose to examine into the methods and the manner in which these funds are expended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield myself 2 more minutes.

If we do not have this section in the bill, which makes it the duty of the officers and officials who are to administer this huge appropriation to furnish information, we are surrendering the power of Congress to make appropriations.

I shall never forget one day when I was walking from the Capitol to the Senate Office Building with former Vice President Jack Garner. He had been Speaker of the House of Representatives. There had been a considerable debate—upon which subject I have forgotten at the moment, but it affected the delegation of congressional power to the Executive. Jack Garner said to me, "Young man"—I was a young man in those days—"when the dome of that Capitol breaks down, the Republic is lost."

What he meant was that when Congress loses its power to supervise the expenditure of the people's money, the democratic government bequeathed to us by the Founding Fathers is gone.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] such time as he may desire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I am very happy to be associated with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming in sponsoring this amendment. Without knowing that he had filed his amendment and had it printed, with the intention of offering it. After learning that he had an amendment with the same objective, which I am confident is adequate in its provisions to achieve the results I desire, I was glad to withhold the amendment I had intended to offer, and I am happy to support his amendment.

As chairman of the Government Operations Committee, and particularly as chairman of the Permanent Investigating Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, I have had some unhappy experiences in trying to get from the executive branch of the Government information which was considered pertinent and vital, and which would have provided information for the Congress which it should have had in the performance of its legislative function. Some of the documents which have been withheld and denied to the committee have been withheld on the pretext that they were interoffice memoranda, that they were working papers in the executive branch of the Government, and that therefore they were not final in the sense that they represented a final decision, and therefore Congress was not entitled to have such information.

I should like to give a concrete illustration. We are all familiar with the Battle Act, and what it was intended to do. During the course of the discussion of the pending bill, we have heard about the problem of our allies selling strategic materials to our potential enemy, while at the same time they have been receiving benefits from the foreign aid legislation.

After negotiations with our allies as to what materials and goods should be embargoed, and as to which were strategic from a war sense and should not be shipped, in order to prevent the potential enemy from getting what he needs to build up his war machine, 16 countries in all, principally the NATO countries, entered into an international agreement and understanding that certain items, consisting of more than 450 in number and description, were not to be sold by our allies. Such an agreement continued until July 1954, at which time what is known as the COCOM conference convened in Paris, for the purpose of downgrading and decontrolling a number of items which had been on the strategic list and under control and embargo by our own country and by our allies. It is to provide military aid and economic aid to those countries that the pending measure is designed.

Before the COCOM conference met, there was organized within the executive branch of the Government a committee composed of representatives from the different agencies and departments involved. This committee was called the Joint Operating Committee, or JOC. Representatives of the Defense Department and other agencies of the Government came before that committee and made their representations with respect to the strategic value and importance of various of the 450 items which were on the list of materials under control and embargo.

Mr. President, I can say, without any fear whatever that my statement can be successfully contradicted or challenged, that in every instance where strategic items were later decontrolled, they were decontrolled over the protests of experts and technicians and those most highly qualified in our own Department of Defense.

Mr. President, I am about to say that they were not agreed upon to be decontrolled at the COCOM conference; in the final analysis one man on the Joint Operating Committee made the decision, and his decision was made over the recommendations of the military branch of the Government.

We asked for those papers. We thought we had a right to learn upon what basis a nonmilitary, civil service employee sat at the head of a committee of that kind, and, over the highest and best military advice available to the Government, took that action. Not only that, but the very best advice of experts who were called in from the outside, who were familiar with the use of the tools and the instrumentalities which were under consideration for decontrol, was rejected.

Yet information as to how the processes of the executive branch of the Government work in the expenditure of billions of dollars of American money is denied to Congress on the ground that it is confidential and inside office memoranda and working material of the executive branch, and that therefore Congress has no business looking at it.

What did we find a few days ago? We read an announcement of the publication of a book containing the inside story of this administration. Of what was that book made up? It was made up, at least in part, by the same character of material and documents, except on a higher level—that of the Cabinet itself—being made available to a private, preferred citizen, a preferred reporter of the press, who was permitted to examine and review the most secret of documents in that area of the executive branch of the Government. He was permitted to use those documents as a basis for the writing of a book for publication for private profit.

That is the issue with which we are confronted. I am not opposed to the book being written. I am not angry or offended that such a book is to be published. Congress can sit silent and quiescent in the face of such treatment if it likes, but I do not propose to be silent about it; I shall register my protest by undertaking by my vote to write into a law, which proposes to spend bil-

lions of dollars abroad, a provision which will let Congress have the information on how the inside of the Government works in the expenditure of those billions of dollars.

If the executive branch of the Government is free to make available secret documents to free enterprise and for profit, and for the benefit of a reporter, then Congress certainly should have the right to know what goes on in connection with the expenditure of billions of dollars of mutual-security funds.

I agree with what the able and distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] said about the responsibility of Congress with regard to the purse strings of the Government. The Government cannot spend \$1 unless Congress appropriates it. The money for foreign aid will not be appropriated unless the pending bill is passed. If we pass the bill to authorize the appropriations, let us say at the same time that Congress expects to look at how the money is expended, that it expects to get the records pertaining to the expenditure, and that we wish to know what is taking place.

Mr. President, this is a serious, a vital matter. The executive branch of the Government, on the flimsiest pretense, denies Congress the records of its stewardship with respect to the money Congress appropriates.

I believe it is time to make it a matter of law that when we provide for the expenditure of billions of dollars to aid our allies, as we do by this measure, we have a right to look at how the processes work in connection with such expenditure. I am happy to support the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am happy to yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator from Arkansas is chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. In connection with the work of that committee, he has received a great deal of information about the activities of the Government under the laws passed by Congress, and he has also been denied, over and over again, information by representatives of the executive department. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I can say that is true. Not only has information been withheld, but employees and officers of the Government in the executive department have been instructed not to testify before the committee with respect to matters within their knowledge.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Do we not know as individual Senators that throughout the world, where this money is going and where contracts for its expenditure are being made, that there are persons and there are governments which are not above corruption?

Mr. McCLELLAN. We certainly know that to be so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is there any basis in logic or patriotism on which any person can say that Congress should not have the power to get information on these subjects?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I will not say that to the constituents I represent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am appalled that on the floor of the Senate tonight there are so few Members listening to the discussion of this amendment. They know the huge amount of money which is authorized to be appropriated and to be expended the Lord knows where by persons whom we do not know under methods of which we have no information and can get none.

Is it not true that we have heard some say that this is an unconstitutional amendment? Is there anything unconstitutional about it?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I do not see anything unconstitutional about it.

Mr. President, I may say, in answer to the Senator from Wyoming, that the Congress, under the Constitution, has the power even to impeach the President of the United States for malfeasance in office. If Congress has the power to impeach the President of the United States for malfeasance in office, certainly it has the power to inquire into the actions and the official conduct of the executive branch of the Government. To say we do not have the power to follow through on appropriations we make is saying that Congress under the Constitution is impotent and powerless.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, how much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, we hope there will be some voice raised in opposition, if there be any opposition to the amendment.

Mr. President, it is 20 minutes to 8. I ask unanimous consent that a quorum call may be had without taking any of the 4 minutes remaining on the part of the supporters of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Four minutes remain under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, and there are 30 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes or so much thereof as I may need.

Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming. I subscribe to the point of view that the Congress of the United States has a right to get the information which it needs in the performance of its legislative duties.

In the Foreign Relations Committee on which I am privileged to serve, and in the Committee on Appropriations on which I serve with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, we have time and time again made requests for information—even information of the highest classification the Government of the United States possesses—and it has been forthcoming. There has not, to my knowledge, at least, been a single bit of information withheld in relation to our mutual-aid program. The State Department, the Department of Defense, the International Cooperation Administration, have brought up and laid before the committee all the details. We have had the testimony of the highest officials of the Government. Members of the committee who were not satisfied that certain pieces of information had been developed in the official presentation requested additional information, and such information was furnished to the committee.

I do not believe a single member of the Committee on Foreign Relations will say that there has been one iota of information withheld by the State Department, the Defense Department, or the International Cooperation Administration in regard to the important measure which is now before the Senate.

I do not know of a single instance of information having been withheld from the Committee on Appropriations when that committee desired it.

I have had some contacts with some of the members of the Committee on Government Operations and learned that certain information to which they felt they were entitled had not been given to them. I personally discussed the matter at the highest levels of the Government and pointed out that, in my judgment, at least, the committee was entitled to have that information in the performance of its legislative duty. I was informed that representatives of the executive branch did go before the committee and present the Battle Act list and certain other information under a security classification. I am not in a position to know whether the classification put on that information was justified or not. I believe it was done, however, in the discretion of the official. But I was told that the information had been presented to the committee.

I recognize that under the Constitution, if Congress has a deep and a vital interest in getting a particular piece of information, and if Congress wants to fulfill its constitutional responsibilities, there is a way Congress can get the information, and that is by saying to any administration, whether it be a Republican or Democratic—and I hope this will not happen if the matter is not of the gravest concern to Congress—"Under the Constitution Congress has control of the purse strings. If we do not get the information, you will not get the money to operate the department."

There is no doubt that Congress has the power to say to any administration, "If Congress does not get the information, you will not get the money with which to operate the department or the agency or the policy."

But that is an entirely different sort of situation from making public every interagency memorandum and personal conversation. From George Washington's time, the Executive has challenged—and I think has properly challenged—every attempt to invade the right of the President of the United States to consult with his advisers in preliminary discussions leading up to the final determination of a policy.

We know that the committees of Congress are always busy. The responsibilities of all of us are spread very thin in order to carry on our work so the burdens are sometimes passed on to subcommittees. Then, in conducting our burdensome duties in Congress, sometimes the subcommittees become subcommittees of one. Then, sometimes a subcommittee of one becomes so busy that the work is passed on to the staff.

If the information desired by a committee is to be obtained according to the intent of the amendment, pretty soon we shall have staff members demanding of the executive branch of the Government certain information, much of which is entitled to be confidential in nature.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Does the Senator from California not acknowledge that there is nothing in the amendment which would enable any staff member to demand anything of any department? The amendment is carefully drawn so as to provide that the authorized committees shall have the right to obtain the information.

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is the point of view of the Senator from Wyoming on the situation. But I say that in past administrations there has been a general searching out of information generally.

I think it is clear that from the first administration in our country's history there has been on this question a difference of opinion between the executive branch and the legislative arm of the Government.

All I point out is that if the subject is important enough, Congress has the power to get the information. But it will require the power of the Senate or the House of Representatives as a body to get it by saying to the executive branch, "If you do not give us the information, we will not give you the funds." On that basis, I think we are standing on sound constitutional ground.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I myself am in favor of the purpose of the amendment, but I shall vote against it. My reason for doing so is that I think a question of this magnitude should be considered on its own feet and be voted up or down accordingly. I do not think this is the time to offer such a proposal, because I do not believe it will have any force so far as the President is concerned.

If a bill were reported by the Committee on Government Operations, which I believe has had some trouble along this line, as have other committees, then I think the matter would be given more consideration, and I would be willing to

vote for such a bill. If a measure of that kind could be passed, and then there was any difficulty, the question could be taken to the Supreme Court for final adjudication.

I have been somewhat disturbed by the information contained in the book published by Mr. Robert Donovan, of the New York Herald Tribune, because evidently this man, who has no official connection with the Government, but is an excellent reporter, has written an exceedingly good book, and has had access to information which the senatorial committee, duly authorized, has not been able to acquire.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I do not wish to engage in a detailed discussion, but books have been written in past administrations, including recent administrations, the material for which undoubtedly was withheld from Congress, or at least was not made available to Congress, but was published as memoirs, or otherwise, for profit.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But none of them was written so well as this one, or so interestingly.

Mr. JACKSON. And the timing was perfect.

Mr. KNOWLAND. For whom?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I suppose all of us are in accord with some of the points which have been advanced as to the desirability of Congress being given the information it needs. I share very much the feeling of the Senator from Montana, provided a proposal such as the one contained in the amendment offered by the Senator from Wyoming has been worked over by a committee and reported to the Senate in a form which is believed to be constitutional. The amendment as offered relates only to programs carried on under the Mutual Security Act.

In dealing with the mutual security program—in fact, in dealing with all the programs with which the Committee on Foreign Relations deals—is the Senator from California aware of any time or any occasion when the committee has been denied any information which it requested from any department of the Government relating to the program under consideration?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I will say categorically that I do not know of a single instance, in the period of time I have served on the Committee on Foreign Relations, and during the entire consideration of the bill, when there was a single item of information which was denied the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder if we might consider one example which arose in the course of the hearings. The Senator from California will remember that in discussing problems relating to Turkey, for instance, mention was made of

the Randall Commission report, which was a highly classified document at the time. I said I thought it would be helpful to the committee if the report were made available to us. Promptly, the Randall Commission report was made available to the committee. The same thing has been true of many other documents and pieces of information which the committee has required. Is that not true?

Mr. KNOWLAND. That is correct; and some of them have been of the highest type of classification.

I happen to serve also on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, of which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico is the chairman. The topmost secrets of the Government are made available daily to that committee. The committee is in constant contact with the Atomic Energy Commission, and the fullest of information is supplied. There is no information in that field which is denied to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Certainly so far as the operations under the mutual security program are concerned, the Committee on Foreign Relations has never had cause to complain, has it?

Mr. KNOWLAND. No; I believe that is correct.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. This is a subject which has interested me during all the years I have been in the Senate. It involves a fundamental question. If such a procedure is to be adopted, it should be adopted on its own merits, and should not be tied in to the mutual security bill.

Furthermore, the language of the amendment is so broad that, as I interpret it, under the phrase "any such information, documents, or other data," Congress could ask for a man's personal opinions or for his personal papers, and the committee would be entitled to get them.

I heartily agree with what the Senator from California has said. I hope that if the question comes before the Senate for consideration, it will come in the way the Senator from Montana has suggested—namely, on its own feet—and that there can be a good, clear debate on a very important question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I am very sympathetic to the objective of the amendment. With reference to the administration, I may remind the Senator from California that the day before yesterday, in a subcommittee meeting, the Administrator of the USIA refused to furnish information which I requested. I do not know whether the refusal is final or not. It was as of that time. I think the Administrator will refuse to give it. But I hope the administration will keep its record as unblemished in that instance as the minority leader thinks it is generally. However, I think that was an arbitrary attitude on the part of the Administrator.

I believe the matter should be handled on its own merits in a separate bill, because this poor bill dealing with foreign mutual aid has so many obstacles to overcome to get enacted that I would hate to include in it a provision wholly controversial in its nature and involving a constitutional question. I would vote for a bill which would accomplish what the amendment seeks to accomplish, because I think certain agents have been arbitrary. I think Mr. Streibert was arbitrary the day before yesterday. The Senator from California was there. He knows what Mr. Streibert refused to furnish to the subcommittee.

Mr. KNOWLAND. In fairness, I will say this to the Senator. I sat in that hearing. I had to leave before it was finally concluded. I did not interpret the statement of Mr. Streibert, in response to the inquiry, as being a refusal to furnish the information requested. I think he pointed out reasons why he felt the information should not be furnished. I do not think the distinguished chairman of the committee, who is also chairman of the subcommittee, pressed him or asked the committee to vote to get that information. If the Senator feels it is essential that he have that information, I shall certainly be prepared, as a member of the committee, to support him in efforts to get it, and I am confident he will get it. I am sure the Senator knows some of the background with regard to that information, and why Mr. Streibert felt he should not release it at that time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I say, I hope he does keep the record clear. It was a tentative refusal. He said he did not wish to give the information; he was not ready to give it; he had reasons why he did not want to give it.

The Senator from California is correct when he states the witness was not pressed at that time. It was the first hearing on that subject. I was not sufficiently sure in my own mind whether the committee should have the information.

I have come to the conclusion that to clutter the bill with a very controversial matter is not very good procedure. We shall have enough difficulty enacting the pending legislation, without including in it a major problem which affects many other activities of the Government, and using this bill as a guinea pig. That is my only objection to the proposal. I think it has great merit as a separate proposal, and that something should be done about the matter.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I wish to thank the Senator from Arkansas for his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BIBLE in the chair). The time of the Senator from California has expired.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me time?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Yes.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I merely wish to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 4 minutes on his own time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not use the whole time remaining to me. I wish to point to an instance in which former Governor Stassen issued a statement at Denver, Colo., saying that, under a Presidential directive, he was going to expend

some \$10 million, just before the last election, for the purchase of coal. There never was a Presidential directive to that effect, but millions were spent for that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Does the Senator recall how much Mr. Stassen spent to send some friends abroad to play Santa Claus?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. If the Senator will examine the record, I think he will find out how much Mr. Stassen spent.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARTHY. In connection with the statement made by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] with respect to information being denied, I want to ask the Senator if he knows that Mr. Stassen appeared before the Appropriations Committee and admitted that, in addition to a classification for security reasons, he had a new classification in the mutual-aid program, whereby he stamped documents "for official use only," and practically any aid administering the mutual-aid program could so stamp documents and they would not be available to the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, do I have any time remaining to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming has 2 minutes remaining to him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say a word in conclusion. Every Senator who votes against this amendment, even though it is applied only to the pending bill, is by his vote saying to all the hundreds and thousands of employees of subordinate grade in the executive departments expending these billions of dollars that they need not make an account thereof to the Congress of the United States. All they have to do is refuse, under the umbrella of the Executive stamp of secrecy.

Mr. SPARKMAN and Mr. KNOWLAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have only 1 minute remaining.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I for one plan to vote against the amendment. I certainly do not subscribe to the idea which has just been stated by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and I am not willing to have those words put in my mouth, because I am making no such statement. I believe information required by committees in order to do their work ought to be supplied. I have said that, so far as the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, and I limit it to that, we have been amply supplied with the information we have requested.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. THYE. I propose to vote against the amendment. I do not think the Senator from Wyoming, by the statement he made, had any intention to convey the idea to those of us who are present in this Chamber, or to those who may read the RECORD that the executive agencies which administer this fund would deny to the Congress the right to any information concerning the funds which had been expended.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I fully concur in the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota. If anyone in any executive agency capriciously seeks to keep information from the Congress, he had better read the Constitution with reference to the congressional control of the purse-strings. There is no question in my mind that if Congress want information badly enough, it can either get it or cut off funds for the agency refusing to give the information requested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the time remaining to him?

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back the time remaining to me.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield back the time remaining to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming has been yielded back. The yeas and nays have been ordered on the amendment, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State Convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the

Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 58, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bible	Humphrey,	McClellan
Bricker	Minn.	Murray
Chavez	Jackson	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	Stennis
Eastland	Kennedy	Symington
Ellender	Langer	Williams
Ervin	Long	Wofford
Frear	McCarthy	Young

NAYS—58

Aiken	George	Millikin
Allott	Goldwater	Monroney
Anderson	Gore	Morse
Barrett	Hayden	Mundt
Beall	Hennings	Neuberger
Bender	Hickenlooper	Pastore
Bennett	Hill	Payne
Bridges	Holland	Potter
Bush	Hruska	Purtell
Butler	Ives	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Case, S. Dak.	Kefauver	Smathers
Clements	Kerr	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Curtis	Kuchel	Sparkman
Dirksen	Lehman	Thye
Duff	Malone	Watkins
Dworshak	Mansfield	Welker
Flanders	Martin, Pa.	
Fulbright	McNamara	

NOT VOTING—15

Byrd	Jenner	Scott
Capehart	Laird	Wiley
Carlson	Magnuson	
Daniel	Martin, Iowa	
Green	Neely	
Humphreys,	Russell	
Ky.	Schoepel	

So the amendment offered by Mr. O'MAHONEY, for himself and Mr. McCLELLAN, to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the proper place in the committee amendment, it is proposed to insert the following:

That after the expiration of 90 days following the effective date of this act none of the funds appropriated for furnishing economic assistance to foreign countries shall be obligated for expenditure until the exemptions for taxpayers and their spouses and dependents have been increased to \$700.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, the reason I am offering the amendment is to call attention to the situation which exists in the United States today: That we cannot afford to increase the exemptions for dependents from \$600 to \$700, but we can give away billions of dollars to foreign countries.

I have always been against giving away our money to foreign countries. This foreign-aid bill which is now before the United States Senate contains provisions for the giving away of billions of dollars of American income to foreign governments.

The money in this bill will be collected in the years to come from the taxpayers of the United States. It represents hard-earned dollars of American workers and American industry. It is a pity that no provision is contained in the Constitution of the United States to require Congress, when money is given away like this, to notify the taxpayers with little pink slips, as faithfully as they receive

their income-tax notices, and to tell them, "We in the Senate today gave away billions of dollars to foreign governments for which you will be billed next April 15." Then, if we changed general election day from November to April 15, I believe there would be some changes made in the way we give away the taxpayers' money abroad.

I do not oppose foreign giveaway programs for reasons of political expediency. I oppose them from a practical, logical standpoint in the interest of the American taxpayer and the welfare of this country. Certainly, if I had politics in mind regarding foreign-aid programs, I would have been supporting them years ago when they were popular. I remember well that in 1950 when I was seeking reelection, my opposition to foreign aid was thrown at me from every stump in South Carolina. But with consistency and with the welfare of my people at heart, I have stuck with my position throughout the years.

My opposition to foreign giveaway programs has always been based upon logical reasoning considering what would happen as a result of these programs. I warned, on many occasions, that our program to develop the so-called undeveloped and underprivileged areas of the world would backfire.

I warned that if we helped to industrialize new or degenerated industrial areas, low world raw material prices and cheap labor would cause us to lose our world markets. Never did I dream that this administration would lower import quotas to this country so that we would even lose our domestic markets. But this is what they did at Geneva when the State Department signed the GATT treaty.

I warned that if we built dams and furnished equipment and money for irrigation and other assistance to develop agriculture abroad we would live to see our farmers suffer from foreign competition.

These two warnings went unheeded; and today the farmers of America and the textile industry and workers of America are suffering more than at any time since the great depression resulting from the last Republican administration.

I made a third, and yet unheeded warning, that eventually we would be expected annually to support our foreign beneficiaries as regularly and as firmly as we do ourselves. I also predicted that the cost of this program would prevent us from ever paying off the national debt and from ever bringing substantial tax relief to our people.

My colleagues, such is the case today. Were it not for foreign aid today we would be balancing our budget, retiring our debts, and cutting taxes. Foreign governments still owe us more than \$17 billion from World War I. I ask, what good did all this aid from World War I accomplish? Italy received over \$2 billion from us but it did us no good in 1939 or 1941. At the outset of World War II, France owed us over \$5 billion, and England over \$7 billion from World War I, but we had to start all over in 1939 with lend-lease and again with

more aid after World War II, until the present day.

During World War II we loaned more than \$42 billion to foreign governments, including over \$10 billion to Russia, nearly \$30 billion to China, and \$18 million to Yugoslavia. I need not ask what this money, material, or whatever it was, accomplished at this time. Certainly it had its effect in winning World War II, but it made no friends for us. There is no gratitude for the mutual aid rendered at that time.

I think it necessary to point out here that only recently it was disclosed that cotton raised in Egypt was being traded off to Red Czechoslovakia for arms which were being used by Egypt to create a crisis in the Near East. This is the same Egypt the State Department wants to send money and technical aid to assist in the construction of dams and irrigation projects to help Egypt develop its arid lands. She will, of course, grow more cotton which will further glut the world market and hurt our cotton farmers. Only 2 weeks ago Egypt flaunted its Communist-supplied military might before the free world in a display of Middle East strength. Obviously, our previous aid of more than \$26 million to that country did little good in our behalf.

But the principal figure of note is the post World War II grants we have given foreign countries. This figure is well over \$51 billion, all of it going for agricultural, industrial, and other so-called "recovery" programs for so-called "war weary" and "war torn" countries of the world.

In addition to these programs, we have donated nearly \$3 billion to the International Monetary Fund and about one-half billion dollars to the International Bank.

The grand total of these figures is \$117,042,902,280.07. Yes, that means we have loaned and given away more than 117 billion dollars to foreign countries with no expectation of ever getting it back.

Mr. President, the picture is very black as I see it. The leadership has failed us. We have daily distortions from the White House and executive offices that are devised to fool and divide us.

The one-world theorists are firmly entrenched and our only weapon to curtail their subtle program of amalgamating America with the rest of the world is to cut off their money. These people I speak of in the State Department and elsewhere want to do away with every conceivable difference between us and the rest of the world. For years they have been working like beavers tearing down trade protection barriers, immigration walls, money exchanges and the like until it is now easier for a foreign government to contact and get assistance from Washington than it is for an American citizen.

Frankly, I am fed up with it all and I think it is time Congress woke up to what is going on.

I want to use the American textile industry as an example of what can and will happen to every taxpayer, worker, business and industry in America if we fail to alter our course. It all takes a pattern, and I believe the pattern in the

textile industry fits the situation precisely. When I refer to the textile industry, I mean every textile employee and the small main street businessmen who depend upon the textile economy.

After World War II, we undertook a program to rehabilitate poor war-torn, war-weary Japan. Nobody then worried about the war-weary, tax-burdened, ration-ridden American public.

Out went the dollars to Japan. We gave \$3 billion in aid to Japan. As late as last year, we gave over \$30 million to Japan. In addition, we have authorized credit and loans up to \$620 million to that country. This was coupled with technical aid, patent rights, machinery, and other guidance—all of it going to build up the Japanese textile industry. It was a plaything at first. Then, as we relaxed our grip and settled back in our easy chair feeling like sanctified philanthropists, the Japanese textile industry began growing like a fire out of control. In a short time the Japanese industry had surpassed its home consumption and began reaching out for foreign markets. First a little here, a little there, and then came GATT.

The same silk-gloved hands of the one-world theorists that had dipped into our Treasury and industry to put the Japanese on their feet—these same top-hatters who have asked us once again to dip into the Treasury to help other countries—these same State Department officials—delivered the death blow to our textile industry at GATT and thereby took one more step in their program to internationalize America. They gave the Japanese tremendous concessions on trade agreements, allowing the Japanese to strike at our domestic markets in full force with their cheap textile products made with 15 cents an hour labor, and 25 cents a pound world cotton.

When the GATT agreement was announced, I denounced it and warned that the American textile industry was operating on a thin profit margin of less than half of what other industries were operating under.

I stated last year on June 15 that the textile workers of America would remember Geneva June 7 as infamously as we all remember Pearl Harbor December 7.

On June 23, 1955, I announced I would support an import quota program to halt Japanese goods from coming into America and destroying the industry. I was met with implications from the administration that I was shooting at bugaboos and no threat to the textile industry existed.

On July 2, last year, I wired the President of the United States urging him to intervene and correct the damage done at GATT before it seriously affected our domestic textile industry and caused a depression.

I was advised that no serious threat to the industry existed, and that if the industry was suffering that it should either seek relief through the Tariff Commission or through the Secretary of Agriculture.

I would like to state here that little relief for the textile employees and industrialists of America can be expected from the Tariff Commission.

In the first place, the workings of the Commission are so slow and cumbersome that by the time it gets around to acknowledging trouble and the need for help, the industry concerned is usually already gone on the rocks.

The velvet industry is a good example of the situation. One of three mills in this industry producing velvet has already gone out of business, and the Commission is just now completing the holding of hearings on the velvet industry's plea for help which was filed over 6 months ago.

In 6 months a depression can swoop down and close the entire textile industry while the Commission deliberates such problems. Furthermore, at these belated hearings last week, one of the most terrible examples of misuse of authority I have ever heard of took place. I have it on unimpeachable authority that representatives of the American textile industry appearing before this American Commission for relief to save jobs of American workers and American industry, were subjected to cross-examination by representatives of foreign governments, namely, Japanese industrialists who are so opposed to textile quotas.

I am reliably informed, however, that when these foreign representatives got into questions regarding manufacturing techniques of the American industry, the Commission very graciously advised the American representatives they did not have to answer such questions.

To me, the fact that foreign government representatives were even allowed to cross-examine Americans before an American Commission is revolting and represents the degeneration that has taken place in bureaucratic government. It points up the need for Congress to personally take up this matter and to obstruct any such future situations by halting all this foreign aid.

On July 22 an army general in Japan stated that "hardly more than passing concern" should be shown by Americans toward the increasing flow of Japanese textiles to this country. I immediately denounced this general's statement and declared the textile industry of America was at the breaking point.

At intermittent times until January of this year I protested the administration's callous attitude toward the textile industry's plight and in January of this year I pleaded with Secretary of Agriculture Benson to recommend to President Eisenhower to apply textile import quotas against Japanese goods and save the industry from further ruin and depression. By this time there was already a rumble or two within and without the textile industry of impending disaster. Already some mills had slackened their production.

On February 13 Secretary of Agriculture Benson announced he would not recommend that the President do anything to relieve the American textile industry through the use of section 22 of the Agricultural Act and application of textile import quotas.

I immediately informed Mr. Benson on February 23rd that his Department's study and recommendations that no action be taken was a complete white-

wash inasmuch as the figures used by the Department for this study were inaccurate and incomplete. At that time I furnished Mr. Benson with further figures which, of course, received no favorable reply.

Later this year, I wrote Secretary of Commerce Sinclair Weeks regarding a statement of his which appeared in the leading press publications quoting him as stating the textile industries face "serious problems." Among other things Mr. Weeks said that textile imports from foreign countries to the United States "have seriously affected some segments of the domestic textile industry, particularly the producers of velveteens, ginghams, garments, and some other cotton manufactured goods."

I pointed out to Mr. Weeks in my letter that the Bates Manufacturing Co. in Maine had cut production 20 percent at two of its major divisions, and advised him of the curtailment of production at a dozen other mills involving the incomes and job security of nearly 12,000 textile workers. At that time among the mills affected were Berkshire-Hathaway, which cut production 20 percent at three Fall River, Mass., plants, and one at North Adams, Mass. At the same time I advised him that Ervin Mills in North Carolina had cut down to a 4-day workweek as had Aragon Mills in Georgia. Brookside Mills, in Tennessee, has halted production of 1,000 looms and was considering closing down completely. Since that time another mill in New England has closed.

In my own State just 2 weeks ago screaming headlines in the local press announced the complete and unconditional closing down of the Camperdown Mill in Greenville. This mill has been in operation for 84 years and only once before during the dark depression had it ceased to operate. It was at this mill many years ago that my own mother as a young girl had worked.

This latest development has thrown more than 250 people out of work. In announcing the closing of the mill, Sydney Bruce, president of the company, stated flatly that Japanese gingham imports into this country were directly and unquestionably responsible for the closing of his mill. I wish to quote here the exact words of the president of this mill:

With the ever-increasing volume of imports of Japanese ginghams into this country, the market for carded ginghams, which we produce, has substantially disappeared.

We have been operating at a loss for the past 2 years, and our inventories of finished goods have been growing until they have reached alarming proportions.

We have made every possible move to attempt to find purchasers for our goods, but in the face of Japanese competition we have been forced to the conclusion that it is impossible for Camperdown Co. to continue in operation.

No business can continue to operate if it cannot sell its product.

Mr. President, I might add here, no American business can continue to operate when faced with unfair competition from a foreign industry which is not only subsidized by the American Government but is given special privileges on the American market.

On June 6 one of the Nation's best known and largest mills announced it was curtailing production and postponing indefinitely a \$10 million expansion program in South Carolina "because of Japanese throatcutting" in the industry. Col. Elliott White Springs, president of Springs Mills, advised the Chester (S. C.) Chamber of Commerce in his announcement:

I wrote you on February 24 that, due to Japanese competition, we had to change our balance and this gave us a surplus of yarn. Therefore, we either had to curtail our production or install additional looms. We don't like to curtail.

After your chamber offered us every cooperation to put the looms in Chester, I wrote you that I would consider enlarging the Eureka plant if I could get permission from the Seaboard to encroach on their property, that I would consider enlarging Springsteen if something could be done about city taxes, and if something were done about Japanese throatcutting.

Since that time the Japanese situation, instead of improving, has deteriorated considerably. They are gaining on us every day. We gave them new machinery as reparations for Pearl Harbor, and the CCC (Commodity Credit Corporation) sells them the same cotton I buy at 10 cents a pound less. We have always been able to meet competition without tears, but we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, GATT, OTC, and the \$64 billion giveaway program while Congress twists our arm.

Therefore, we have been forced to revise our plans and, instead of expanding, we are going to have to curtail. It is with regret that I tell you reluctantly the Springs cotton mills operations will be reduced indefinitely, and that we will have to postpone our plans for installing additional looms.

By "indefinitely," I mean until my customers find out that all that is yellow is not gold, or the public decides our textile industry is not part of foreign aid. If this meets with the approval of the people of Chester, I suggest they write President Eisenhower and tell him how much they love Secretary Dulles.

Prior to Mr. Springs' announcement the South Carolina textile manufacturers, meeting at Sea Island, Ga., issued a new plea for the administration to render assistance to the industry. Meanwhile, more reports from other States indicate further cuts can be expected in the industry. The reports are almost daily, following the same pattern of curtailed production, short workweeks and closing mills.

Another recent development has been the placement of the Kendall Mills in South Carolina on a 4-day workweek, which is seriously affecting the incomes and business stability in the Pelzer area of my State.

The American textile industry last year made an average profit of only 2.4 percent of its total sales. All other industries in the Nation made an average net profit of 5.3 percent which is nearer a normal profit margin. The Japanese industry, to the contrary, by its own admission, currently is making an average profit of more than 12 percent, or nearly 6 times that which the American industries are making. Let me read a Tokyo dispatch appearing in the Cotton Trade Journal, which is the international weekly newspaper of the cotton industry:

TOKYO, June 9.—Japan's "big ten" cotton spinners, who claimed to be in bad financial

shape in October 1955, ended the next 6-month period in April 1956, with profits that averaged about 12 percent. A "big ten" spokesman claimed that in April 1956, spinners were making a little over \$50 a bale when made up into cotton piece goods.

The "big ten" also manufacture rayon and wool fabrics, and reports indicate that profits on these have been good. But cotton had the best record, doubling the 1955 May-October period profits during the November 1955-April 1956 period.

As a result all 10 companies have decided to increase capital and have predicted that the business term ending in October 1956, would see even greater profits.

In every case of retrenchment by the American textile industry—in every case of a closing mill—in every case of announced layoffs or curtailed production—the officials and the workers involved have blamed without reservation the influx of cheap Japanese goods to this country.

Mr. President, how can anyone meet that kind of competition? It is a question of 15 or 16 cents an hour labor competing with \$1 and \$1.60 an hour. American workers are paid 10 times as much as the Japanese workers are paid. I do not say that that is too much to pay our workers. I believe that they ought to be paid even more. However, that is the kind of competition we must meet.

Despite the charges of the industry and responsible officials in the textile world that the Japanese imports are to blame for their difficulties, the administration, through its international-minded diplomats, has callously ignored the situation and has, instead, insisted that the Japanese imports are not affecting the industry.

It is not only a question of the amount of the material that comes back to the United States. The Japanese are forcing the market down. For example, in the field of cloth, the Japanese producers will make a raid on velveteen. They make their sales in that field. The market goes down. Then they pick out towels, and the price of towels goes down. The American producers cannot meet that kind of competition. Then they will turn their attention to sheets and pillow cases. They take the articles one at a time, until they force the market down and until the American mills cannot meet the competition and cannot keep the wheels rolling and cannot keep our workers employed because of the unfair competition. Foreign aid has done that.

Two weeks ago Monday a delegation of citizens from Chester, S. C., met at the State Department to urge some relief be given to the American textile industry and brought with them a petition bearing the names of 5,000 citizens of that county who are suffering economically as result of the depression now sweeping the textile industry.

I advised the Senate of this meeting at that time, but what I did not know was what the administration would say at the meeting. The Assistant Secretary of State in charge of far eastern affairs, backed up by a battery of 14 officials from the State Department, the Agriculture Department, and the Commerce Department, flatly stated that the textile

industry of America was not being affected by Japanese imports to this country.

This high official declared that the American textile industry was using the Japanese imports to this country as a convenient scapegoat. This official said, "If we did not have any Japanese textile industry, the American textile industry would still have the problem now confronting it." He even went so far as to say that if the Japanese Islands were to sink in the Pacific Ocean, the American textile industry would still be closing its mills and idling its employees. He said the people had been completely misinformed and that the Japanese textile industry was being used as a whipping boy.

Those who attended the meeting were astonished at the stubborn position held by this official. One would think we were discussing an American problem with an official of the Japanese Government and not a representative of the United States. They claim to hold sympathy for the industry, but they callously ignore the situation and continue on their road of appeasing the foreign industrialists at the sacrifice of the American industry.

I wish to remind the Senate of the now famous "Dear Joe" letter that Ike sent minority leader of the House of Representatives, JOE MARTIN, last February 17. President Eisenhower, in that letter, among many other generalities, told Mr. MARTIN, and I now quote from his letter:

I wish also to comment on the administration of this legislation if it is enacted into law. Obviously, it would ill serve our Nation's interest to undermine American industry or to take steps which would lower the high wages received by our working men and women. Repeatedly I have emphasized that our country's economic strength is a pillar of freedom everywhere in the world. This program, therefore, must be, and will be, administered to the benefit of the Nation's economic strength, and not to its detriment. No American industry will be placed in jeopardy by the administration of this measure. Were we to do so, we would undermine the ideal for which we have made so many sacrifices and are doing so much throughout the world to preserve.

Mr. President, we have Mr. Eisenhower's promise. I ask now where is the fulfillment from him or the executive department at his command?

To complete the picture of what is happening, I believe you should certainly be advised of a comment or confidence given to the Japanese by Secretary of State Dulles recently. The Japanese reported out of Tokyo that Mr. Dulles had told them: "We confirm"—"we" being the United States—"that no import restrictions will be put into practice." This statement came on June 17 on the heels of Secretary Benson's confused announcement which he backed out of the next day to the effect that the administration was considering the imposition of textile import quotas.

Now, I ask the United States Senate this question, who is keeping their promise and who is not telling the truth?

The President has promised that he would not let this program hurt any American industry.

The Secretary of Commerce has stated that the American industry is being hurt and has admitted such publicly.

Every official of the cotton industry has stated flatly that the textile industry of America is in a curtailed condition and faces serious depression unless something is done.

Presidents of companies, heads of unions, workers, and others in the textile industry have blamed the Japanese imports to this country for the closing of every mill and the general curtailment within the industry.

The State Department, however, brands as a fraud this allegation of the textile industry and claims the Japanese industry is being used as a "whipping boy." In my way of thinking, the State Department, which is very apparently running the whole show, has practically accused the American workers and the American industry of lying to the people of this country.

I see the chairman of the Agricultural Committee is present on the floor. I think he knows that when bills are introduced which would help the farmers the inquiry is always made as to whether they would benefit foreign interests, thus throwing a block in the way of anything which would help our own people.

The State Department has taken the position of defending the Japanese industrialists against the American people.

It is high time that the United States Senate take action to see to it that the American textile industry is protected and that no such dilemma ever again recurs in any other field of American business, labor, or industry. I shall certainly take the word of my people, of the leaders of the textile industry, of the workers in those mills, and of the people in the street who are suffering because of this depression in the textile industry before I will take the word of a State Department official—and I hope this United States Senate will do likewise.

The United States is the only country which helped the Japanese get on their feet and is now allowing Japanese textile goods to come into its borders on a wholesale basis. Thirteen countries who participated in the GATT treaty have refused to allow Japanese textile goods to come into their borders. These countries include Australia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Cuba, Luxembourg, Haiti, Great Britain, South Africa, New Zealand, the Netherlands, France, and Rhodesian-Nyasaland. If Great Britain and those other countries will not allow any Japanese textile imports within their borders, why should we continue to allow them to come in on a wholesale basis and idly sit by and watch our textile industry go broke and our textile workers walk the streets without jobs?

The State Department and other Government agencies responsible for this problem cite as their principal reason for not imposing textile quotas on Japanese goods the fact that the Japanese have announced they will place self-imposed restrictions on their imports to the United States. This is a ridiculous situation in which we are placing the welfare of our industry and people at

the mercy and whims of the Japanese industrialists.

Shortly after the Japanese announced their voluntary quotas, a little-publicized news release from Tokyo announced that the Japanese Government's insistence on quota limitations on imports to the United States are, "Designed to forestall a move in the United States Congress to enact import quotas when it reconvenes in January." In other words, there is no good faith in this voluntary program but simply a device to fool and divide us.

There are many more facts and figures and comments and information regarding the situation in the textile industry which I could have brought with me today, but I do not believe it is necessary. The picture is quite clear as to what has resulted to the economy of the textile industry and the entire Nation because of our giving away money and information to foreign countries to help develop their industrial and agricultural potentialities. What has happened in the case of the textile industry is bound to happen in other industries. It may be my State and the textile industry today—but, Mr. President, it will be your State and your industry tomorrow, unless we immediately halt this giveaway program.

Mr. President, the reason why I have offered this amendment is to call to the attention of the people of the United States the fact that we cannot afford to give a little, meager exemption to dependents, or to increase the exemptions of American taxpayers from \$600 to \$700, but we can give away billions of dollars with one stroke of a pen. I, for one, do not agree to such expenditures, and I shall vote against the bill when it comes to a vote tonight.

I am glad to see that Members of the United States Senate are beginning to shy off a little bit from foreign aid, and I hope that in the near future they will see fit to cut it off entirely.

Remember this, Mr. President, if we will check the matter we will find that more than half of our national debt has been caused by our foreign giveaway programs. We do not have the money; we are always getting in debt. Every time we give away money to other nations, we go further and further into debt.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time if the Senator from South Carolina will yield back the remainder of his time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on both sides having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment designated "6-26-56-B."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida ask that his amendment be read, or does he ask that it be printed without reading?

Mr. SMATHERS. I ask that the amendment be printed in the RECORD without being read and in the course of my remarks I will explain what it proposes to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment proposed by Mr. SMATHERS to the committee amendment is as follows:

On page 37, line 11, strike out "section" and insert in lieu thereof "sections."

On page 37, between lines 21 and 22, insert the following:

"Sec. 422. Economic Development Fund for Latin American Countries: (a) The Congress of the United States reaffirms the policy of the United States to further promote friendly relations and Western Hemispheric economic development through assisting the peoples of Latin America in their efforts to obtain economic and social well-being, to safeguard basic rights and liberties, and to protect their security and independence. The Congress hereby recognizes that fundamental to these goals is an expanding economic growth of the Latin American area based upon self-help and mutual cooperation and full utilization of already existing resources and knowledge. The Congress expresses the willingness of the people of the United States to support the foregoing objectives to the extent to which the countries in the area continue to make effective use of their own resources and external resources otherwise available to them.

"(b) In order to carry out the purposes of this section, there is hereby authorized to be established a fund, to be known as the 'Economic Development Fund for Latin American Countries' (hereinafter referred to as the 'fund') and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the President for the fiscal year 1957 an amount of \$35,000,000, such amount to remain available until expended.

"(c) The President is authorized to utilize the appropriations made available for the fund to accomplish in the Latin American area the policies and purposes declared in this act and to disburse on such terms and conditions, including transfer of funds, as he may specify to any person, corporation, or body of persons however designated, or to any Latin American government, agency, or organization or group of governments or agencies as may be appropriate: *Provided*, That such assistance shall emphasize loans rather than grants wherever possible, and not less than 75 per centum of the funds appropriated pursuant to this section shall be available only for furnishing assistance on terms of repayment in accordance with the provisions of section 505, and not more than 25 per centum of said funds may be allocated for assistance to any one country.

"(d) In utilizing the fund, the President shall give preference to: (1) projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting health, education, and sanitation in the area as a whole or among a group or groups of countries of the area, and (2) such joint health, education, and sanitation assistance programs undertaken by members of the Organization of American States."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, first I want to congratulate the Committee on Foreign Relations upon what, obviously, is a very conscientious and, I think, thorough piece of work on the bill.

The amendment which I now propose has to do with Latin America. In this particular respect, I also want to congratulate the committee because it has recognized some of the problems of the Central and South American countries,

even though what has been provided is not as much as I think those countries deserve, nor as much as should be done for them.

I point out that the total amount which is provided in the bill for Central and South America is still less than 3 percent of the total amount which is authorized by the bill.

If we go back to 1946, when the foreign-aid program first got underway, we will discover that the amount of help which has been given to the Central and South American countries has actually been less than 2 percent of the tremendous sum of money which has been authorized for our foreign-aid program.

Simply stated, the proposed amendment would create a special economic development fund for Latin America with an authorized appropriation to the President of \$35 million to remain available until expended. The amendment in emphasizing loans rather than grants provides that not less than 75 percent of the funds shall be available only for furnishing assistance on a loan basis. Since health, education and sanitation are primary factors in preventing the economic development of Latin America, the amendment contains a proviso that the President in utilizing the fund shall give preference to projects or programs that will clearly contribute to promoting health, education, and sanitation in this region, and such joint programs undertaken by the members of the Organization of American States. The authorized appropriation under the amendment would be in addition to the recommended authorization under the bill, as reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee.

There is nothing novel about the creation of this fund. We have in the past set up a similar fund for Asia in the amount of \$200 million, \$100 million of which was appropriated last year, and it is my understanding that the administration has requested that the balance be appropriated this year. Under the provisions of the bill as reported out by the Foreign Relations Committee, a special fund providing for an authorization of \$100 million is set up for the Middle East. It is high time that we arouse ourselves from the slumber of the past and give to Latin America a little special treatment, too. In setting up this regional economic development fund for Latin America as proposed by the amendment it will give to this area the special treatment which it has so long deserved in our foreign-aid program, and at the same time it demonstrates by deed that our good neighbor policy is more than just a play on words.

The special economic development fund in the amount of \$35 million proposed by the amendment will go a long way in further promoting and strengthening our good neighbor relations with this region, which is so important to us from the standpoint of trade, strategy, and raw materials. To assist Latin America in the solution of the economic difficulties which beset the area is in our own enlightened self-interest.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me say that this matter was given very careful and sympathetic consideration by the committee. Of course, the Senator will recall that originally the amendment called for \$100 million, and then \$50 million. There was a very close vote on the amendment. Everybody recognized its merit.

One thing that should be called to the attention of the Senate with reference to the amendment is that 75 percent of the funds will be in loans, and not more than 25 percent in grants, and they relate to health, sanitation, and education. I think the committee as a whole was quite sympathetic to the proposal.

I am authorized by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and my understanding is that the minority leader agrees, to say that we are willing to accept the amendment and take it to conference.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. I certainly want to join with my colleague, the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] in advocacy of the amendment. While on vacation in Latin America, I saw the needs of the people of that hemisphere. It is the opinion of the junior Senator from Idaho that they are deserving people. They need inspiration and aid. They are not like Tito, whom we bailed out yesterday. They love freedom, and they are seeking to make themselves stronger.

I commend the Senator from Florida, and shall support his amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point two articles which point up the fact that the Communists are making great attempts to get control of Latin America at this particular time.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Daily Times of June 26, 1956]

GUATEMALAN PRESIDENT DECLARES SIEGE STATE—ARMY TAKES CONTROL AFTER RIOT—4 KILLED, 17 HURT AS POLICE FIRE UPON STUDENT DEMONSTRATORS

GUATEMALA, June 26.—President Carlos Castillo Armas put the army in control of Guatemala today after demonstrations in which four students were killed.

The President declared a state of siege—modified form of martial law. The army, assuming control, asked the cooperation of the people to avoid further clashes.

AFTER CRACKDOWN

The deaths came last night during student demonstrations on the capital's main street against a Government crackdown on Communist agitation. In addition there were 17 wounded.

The victims were in a parade of several hundred students marching toward the Government Palace to protest curtailment of civil liberties under the state of alarm imposed Sunday by President Carlos Castillo Armas' regime.

ONE GIRL WOUNDED

About half the marchers were girls. One girl was wounded. So was a policeman.

The state of alarm put Guatemala under a form of martial law. The government said it was necessary to prevent "seditious disorders" plotted by Communists.

Soon after last night's shooting, the government ordered censorship of news dispatches sent abroad.

The students marched defiantly from a meeting at the university. Officials had sent them a warning message that they would be "swept from the streets" if they attempted to stage a protest.

The procession turned into Sixth Avenue, the principal business street of the capital, and headed to the President's offices at the end of the thoroughfare.

FIRED INTO AIR

A witness said a detachment of about 20 policemen, drawn up across the avenue outside a movie theater, ordered the marchers to halt.

"The police fired into the air," the witness reported. "The students kept coming, singing the national anthem."

"Police then started firing into the marchers, while police reinforcements rushed up. Some police were firing pistols, others sub-machineguns."

GUATEMALA CLAIMS RED PLOT, GETS TOUGH

GUATEMALA.—The Guatemalan Government, announcing discovery of a Communist plot, has imposed a form of martial law on the country to "prevent seditious disorders."

President Carlos Castillo Armas' regime decreed a "state of alarm" after police broke up a mass meeting yesterday sponsored by the newly formed national civic committee.

Demonstrators at the gathering of about 400 persons outside the capital's railway station had distributed leaflets demanding cancellation of Guatemala's mutual-aid pact with the United States and a lifting of the ban on Communist activities.

A Government statement charged the meeting was part of "a subversive plot by Communists hiding within the territory of the republic to disturb the peace."

Six persons were arrested and telephone service was interrupted for 4 hours. The state of alarm decree suspends a dozen or so constitutional rights and allows the Government to prohibit public meetings, make arrests without warrants and impose censorship.

There was no interference with news dispatches sent abroad, however.

Police cordoned off the downtown area after dispersing the demonstrators and no further incidents were reported.

The meeting was called as a celebration of the 12th anniversary of the downfall of Dictator Jorge Ubico who was driven from the country and died later in New Orleans.

Another anniversary meeting scheduled for today was ordered cancelled although its sponsors are considered friendly to Castillo Armas.

The Government claimed Communist plotters planned to spread panic and had instructed yesterday's demonstrators "to use their arms in order to blame the Government for the serious consequences of disorders."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I yield back my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment has been yielded back. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The committee amendment is open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I assumed other amendments would be offered.

I send to the desk my amendments, and ask to have them stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the action of the Senate in agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended, is rescinded, and the amendments offered by the Senator from New Hampshire will be received, and they will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed on page 30, line 2, to strike out "\$243,000,000" and insert "\$208,000,000."

On page 30, line 10, to strike out "\$80,000,000" and insert "\$45,000,000."

On page 30, before the period at the end of line 11, to insert a colon and the following:

Provided, That not more than \$35,000,000 of such funds shall be used for assistance to India.

On page 31, line 19, to strike out "\$140,500,000" and insert "\$135,500,000, of which not more than \$5,000,000 shall be used for assistance to India."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair should like to inquire whether the Senator from New Hampshire desires the amendments to be considered en bloc.

Mr. BRIDGES. I ask unanimous consent to have the amendments considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, we have heard a good deal about the foreign-aid program. As I have said to the Senate on various occasions, and I repeat it now, I am perfectly willing to help nations which are our friends and allies and are willing to help themselves; but this pouring out of money to nations that are not true allies, and are not even really neutral nations is another thing. One of these nations is India.

I know a great hue and cry will be made by the do-gooders of this country about India. India poses as a neutral nation, but at least 90 percent of the actions of India have by calculated design been contrary to the best interests of the United States.

The Mutual Security Act for fiscal year 1957 would authorize an expenditure of \$80 million in aid to India. That is \$70 million for development assistance and \$10 million for technical cooperation.

What I probably should offer is an amendment to cut out aid to India altogether, but in view of the fact that such an amendment probably would not be adopted in view of the action on Yugoslavia, and since there may be some good in assisting India, I am willing to take a calculated gamble on part of the

money that has been proposed. For that reason, my amendment would cut in two the amount of aid to India.

A few days ago I sat and listened to the American Ambassador to India, for whom I have warm affection and high personal esteem both as our Ambassador and a former member of this body; but I just could not swallow the argument he was making for aid to India. For that reason my amendment proposes a 50 percent cut in the amount requested.

The United States is now engaged in a bitter struggle to prevent Soviet Russia from conquering more territory and enslaving more peoples in Asia. In this struggle, the United States has allies, the NATO and SEATO countries. India prefers not to be one of those allies. Nehru has said, and these are his words:

"The only camp we should like to be in is the camp of peace and good will, which should include as many countries as possible and be opposed to none." In the face of current political realities, it is impossible to have your cake and eat it too—as Nehru would like to do.

Nehru would like to have us believe that India is strictly neutral. However, in the United Nations, India has consistently sided with the Communist bloc and against the United States.

This is no bona fide neutrality.

At the Bandung Conference, India was the leader of the pro-Soviet and pro-Communist China faction.

That was not strict neutrality.

And, let us not forget that when "neutral" Nehru visited Mao Tze-tung—the Chinese Communist dictator who was responsible for the slaughter of over 50,000 American boys in Korea—he drew up a formula of five points for peaceful co-existence which was exactly what the Soviets were saying to all the world. He became a willing mouthpiece for Russian and Chinese Communist propaganda.

That was not strict neutrality.

It is my considered opinion that now is the time—now when this foreign-aid measure is under discussion—for this body to ponder the question asked by our distinguished colleague, Minority Leader KNOWLAND, on January 17—and I quote his words:

Can our economic system survive prolonged burdens of building a system of collective security and a system of neutralism at one and the same time? If the neutralists are to receive the benefits and have none of the responsibilities of those in the collective defense system, will not this act as an incentive plan to build up the fence sitters?

I say it will.

And Nehru's India is the prime example of our futile and dangerous policy of being equally, or even more generous to so-called neutrals than to proven allies.

Mr. President, I am disturbed that I as a United States Senator have to stand up on the floor of the Senate and argue the folly of our aid policy as it concerns India, but folly it is in my opinion.

No one will deny that in these dangerous times, there is need for us not to stint in the use of funds for our national security. But it should not be necessary to have to plead with this body to decide, intelligently, to offer our aid and

support only to those proven allies who are willing to share with us the calculated risks involved in the worldwide struggle against the deadly Communist menace. Who, in view of the facts, can—in good conscience—argue that we continue unconditionally to aid Nehru when he has definitely set himself up as an active “neutral” against the best interests of the United States?

The facts are clear, Mr. President, we gambled on Yugoslavia and lost. We are gambling on NATO and SEATO and most of it appears to be a pretty good gamble but we would be less than honest with ourselves if we did not admit there were some weak spots. We are gambling on India and frankly it is a gamble that I do not feel like backing with too many American taxpayer dollars. The wisdom of a certain biblical axiom keeps asserting itself to me. It is in effect—that those who are not for us are against us. Certainly the so-called neutralism of Nehru is a one-way street and it does not run in our direction.

I want to emphasize the fact that I am not writing off India as I have written off Yugoslavia, even though I think she is a dubious gamble. That is why my amendment calls for a cut in aid—not complete elimination of aid to India.

I might add that not all of my reluctance to go along with the full program is due entirely to the position Nehru takes, although let us not forget that when the neutral Nehru visited the Communist Chinese dictator, who was responsible for the slaughter of tens of thousands of American boys in Korea, he drew up a formula of five points for peaceful coexistence, which was exactly what the Soviet Union was saying to all the world. And by doing this he became a willing mouthpiece for the Communist and Chinese propaganda.

My reluctance to go along with the full program is also due to what I consider the lack of an imaginative program designed specifically to meet the Indian situation. The fact that we do not have a better oriented program is a matter of some amazement to me in view of the fact that Nehru and other Indian leaders have long since pointed out the sources of friction. We must remember that India has but recently emerged from what has been called a colonialism. Her national pride is intense and she resents being considered a weak sister or a poor relation in the company of nations. Nehru likes to pretend that India can accomplish her goals within her own resources and that is why he belittles our aid in speeches while he holds out his palm for as much as we will drop in it. The concept of our program if it is to be successful as far as India is concerned should be in such form as treats India as an adult in the family of nations if we are to have any success whatsoever. Economic aid should be in the form of loans and there should be only such technical assistance as can be assimilated and integrated into the Indian economy in her own struggles to help herself.

Our present giveaway program should be tapered off to the vanishing point because we never could give the vast subcontinent of India enough giveaway for

her economic salvation without her making a mighty effort of her own and indeed our efforts to do so would not only impoverish us but create poor relations in the bargain. In tapering off giveaway to the vanishing point there is no better time to begin than the present. Let us do so by adopting my amendment which cuts it by 50 percent. And then let us proceed from there cautiously and hard-headedly in the development of a new program better tailored to the factual situation which we all know exists.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I call for order in the Chamber.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to have order in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McNAMARA in the chair). The Senate will be in order.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, on the question of agreeing to my amendment to the committee amendment, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, again let me pay my respects to the distinguished statesman from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who has the courage to state his convictions when seemingly 90 percent of the Members of the Senate do not see the light.

This afternoon before the Internal Security Subcommittee there appeared a man who has opposed the Polish Communist conspiracy. He told our subcommittee, and, through our subcommittee, the world, what the Polish people have done and are doing to obtain their freedom. They have even attacked tanks, operated by their oppressors, with their bare hands as they raised aloft bloody flags.

Mr. President, how did you feel, and how did the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire feel, and how did I feel, last night, when a majority of the Senate voted to give aid to Yugoslavia and Tito, whom every Member of the Senate knows is a Communist. In heaven's name, what would be the position of the Senators who voted in favor of giving aid to Yugoslavia, if in the future, the freedom-loving people of Yugoslavia—about whom we heard so many words spoken during the debate in the Senate, last evening—should rise up and say, “We want freedom.” In that event, we would know that, as a result of the vote cast last night in the Senate, those people would be shot down with munitions of war obtained by means of the money the Senate voted to give to Tito, to be used, at least in part, for the purchase of shells by Tito. It was said that the United States had previously given guns to Tito, and therefore the United States now must make it possible for Tito to purchase shells—using our money for that purpose—to be fired by the guns with which we already have provided him.

I predict that if the people of Yugoslavia should decide they want freedom, and should revolt—as the people of Poland have done—Senators who voted

in favor of United States aid to Tito may find blood dripping from their hands.

Mr. President, I have the most profound respect and admiration for the great statesman who has just spoken—the senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who is the senior Republican Member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. In fact, Mr. President, I believe that many of the people of the United States are crying for us to follow the advice of the great senior Senator from New Hampshire. I plead with the Senate to pay heed to his words of advice. I commend to every person in the United States what he has said, and I hope that his counsel, as it will appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be read very widely throughout the country.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. President, at present the United States is going through a period similar to the one through which it went in the 1930's, when Mr. Chamberlain's umbrella and the slogan “peace in our time” were the symbols of the day.

Not many of the present Members of the Senate were Members of the Senate at that time. Too many of those Members of Congress hopefully crawled under the umbrella. Many of those Members found that umbrella little protection from the deluge of votes against them which followed and the freedom-loving people of the world found that same umbrella little protection when the shots of battle began to fly.

I feel that I stand at the same crossroads of decision as I did when some of us in this body took a very strong stand in favor of a two-ocean Navy and a large Air Force. We opposed the sale of aviation gasoline and scrap iron to Japan. We were defeated on those issues and although history is said to repeat itself, I hope it does not do so today.

Mr. President, I do not ask for a complete end to foreign aid. I shall support any reasonable foreign-aid program. But I ask that we be selective in the foreign aid we give, and that we help only the countries who will help themselves and who will be true allies of the United States. Let us not throw American money and substance to the wolves of international intrigue.

Mr. President, if there are no questions to be asked of me regarding my amendment to the committee amendment, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President—

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Georgia such time as he may desire, of the time under my control.

Mr. GEORGE. I shall use only 2 minutes at most.

Mr. President, the India program includes \$30 million in surplus agricultural commodities. They will be furnished from our own surplus now on hand. Of the remainder or the balance, 75 percent will be in loans. In other words, \$30 million will be used to pay for certain agricultural commodities which we now have in long supply; and of the balance of the aid which India will receive under this program, 75 percent will be in loans.

On the basis of philosophy, on the basis of metaphysical convictions, and on the basis of religion, India is probably actually neutral. She does not want to join in an alliance. I myself do not care, and I do not believe we should be greatly concerned when a country is really neutral and intends to remain neutral and to protect her own neutrality. I do not think we should be very greatly concerned about that country.

I hope very much that this amendment will not be agreed to, because when it is analyzed, it will be seen that we would be hurting ourselves, largely, because we ought to get rid of the surplus. The surplus agricultural commodities are needed in India. As for the entire balance, 75 percent of it is in actual loans. I do not think that program will hurt this country. I believe it would be very much better for us frankly to say, "If you are a bona fide neutral country, and propose to protect your neutrality, we will not say that all aid will be withdrawn."

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I feel that I must speak on this subject. I have spent some time at the United Nations, where I knew the Indian representatives. Especially I knew Madam Pandit, who was India's Ambassador to the United States for several years, as we all know.

I have been troubled by the subject of neutralism, to which the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire refers, but I have tried to understand the neutralism of India.

In going through some of the records of the country I find that over a period of hundreds of years—perhaps thousands of years—the Indians have been a nonwarring country. So far as I know, until India got into the recent trouble with Pakistan, it had never become involved in military actions. The tradition and religion of India are against warfare. Mahatma Gandhi laid down the tradition of nonresistance, and he urged neutrality for India, insofar as other countries of the world are concerned.

I am not defending Mr. Nehru, especially, because I think he has made a great many mistakes. He has been very much misunderstood. Perhaps some of the prejudice against him is justified. From many talks with Mr. Nehru I became convinced that he was trying to be neutral. He had the Chinese Communists on one border and the Russians on the other border, and he was in a very difficult position. One thing that was very clear to me was that he was anti-Communist within India. The inconsistency of his position with regard to Kashmir and Pakistan is partially true.

I recall the time, a few years ago, when we tried to give grain to India. I introduced the legislation. I was requested by the Indian Embassy not to make it a grant, but to make it a loan. We made it a loan, and the Indians still are paying on that loan. The other agricultural products sent to India have been primarily on a loan basis. There may have

been some grants, but the transactions were primarily loans.

I have difficulty in seeing why we should be prejudiced against India at this time because of the question of neutrality. I feel that a nation which wants to be neutral, in the sense that it does not want to join any military alliance with other countries, should be entitled to take that position. We have such a relationship with Burma and with Indonesia today. I think we would be making a mistake if we were to say, "Unless you join our military alliance we cannot give you any further aid."

The 380 million people in India are trying to find a better way of life. God knows, they are starving most of the time. In my opinion, it would be very shortsighted and wrong in principle not to let those people feel that we have a human interest in them and are interested in trying to help them to be self-sustaining. They have been under the Government of Great Britain for many years. Imperialism was the condition under which they lived. Finally they obtained their freedom. India is a new, free country. She is groping her way.

With a thorough understanding of the feelings of my friend from New Hampshire, I hope he will not press this amendment, because I feel that we would be making a mistake at this time if we were to deny or cut aid for the reason given, namely, that India will not take sides with us in the cold war.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to myself.

I point out the fact that I am not advocating the denial of aid to India. I am merely raising a cautionary flag, and proposing to cut the appropriation for India in half. She would still be allowed \$40 million. Forty million dollars is a great deal of money to give to a country which is nominally neutral, but which is on the other side of the fence better than 90 percent of the time.

I have heard the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. GEORGE] say that India is truly neutral. There is some argument to be made in favor of a country which is truly neutral, as the Senator has said. I could continue for hours, pointing out one position after another which India has taken, contrary to the best interests and the leadership of the United States and contrary to any recognized concept of neutrality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. BRIDGES. I am prepared to do so if the other side will do likewise.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT].

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to support the position of the chairman of our committee. I think it would be a great mistake if this amendment were adopted.

India represents the largest group of free citizens in the world, the largest free nation on earth. If we were to adopt this amendment, I think we would be creating a condition which would

justify a loss of confidence on the part of India in our cooperation in the future.

In my opinion, India is neutral in the true sense of the word. I believe she intends to remain neutral. I think that is a relationship which has been beneficial to this country.

It seems to me that what was said in the debate with respect to Yugoslavia would apply to India—not that India is the same kind of country as Yugoslavia from the standpoint of democratic government, but I think the most we can hope for in the future will be that India will remain neutral, and free from domination by Russia or any other Communist country. If she makes a success of her effort to create a strong democratic society, it will be the greatest achievement she could contribute to the defense of the West.

Everyone knows that there is competition between China and India to see which one will be able to create the best life for its citizens, one following the totalitarian system and the other following the democratic system. If India can succeed, without sacrificing the liberty of the individual, in creating a reasonable standard of life under a democratic system, it will be one of the greatest contributions to the stability and security of the West. It will be one of the greatest proofs of the basic validity of the democratic process that could be furnished.

I hope the pending amendment will not be agreed to. Although it involves money in addition, it is, in a sense, a criticism, and a further evidence of our lack of respect or regard for that country.

I deeply regret the necessity for canceling the visit of Mr. Nehru. On top of that, to agree to this amendment would be very unwise strategy, in my judgment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of the time on our side, with the understanding that the Senator from New Hampshire will yield back his time.

Mr. BRIDGES. I agree to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time on the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire is exhausted or yielded back.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee amendment. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. BENDER (after having voted in the negative). I have voted "nay." On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I withdraw my vote.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "nay."

On this vote the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "nay."

The Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY]. If present and voting the Senator from Washington would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] if present and voting would vote "nay."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has been announced previously.

The Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPPFEL], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on official business.

I wish to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Arizona would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPPFEL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Wisconsin would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea."

I also announce that if present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 56, as follows:

YEAS—23

Barrett	Eastland	McCarthy
Bible	Ervin	McClellan
Bricker	Frear	Mundt
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Welker
Case, S. Dak.	Hruska	Williams
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Wofford
Cotton	Langer	Young
Curtis	Malone	

NAYS—56

Aiken	Hennings	Monroney
Allott	Hill	Murray
Anderson	Holland	Neuberger
Beall	Humphrey,	O'Mahoney
Bennett	Minna	Pastore
Bush	Ives	Payne
Butler	Jackson	Potter
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Purtell
Clements	Kefauver	Robertson
Dirksen	Kennedy	Saltonstall
Douglas	Kerr	Scott
Duff	Knowland	Smathers
Dworshak	Kuchel	Smith, Maine
Ellender	Lehman	Smith, N. J.
Flanders	Long	Sparkman
Fulbright	Mansfield	Stennis
George	Martin, Pa.	Symington
Gore	McNamara	Thye
Hayden	Millikin	Watkins

NOT VOTING—17

Bender	Green	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Humphreys,	Morse
Capehart	Ky.	Neely
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Daniel	Laird	Schoeppel
Goldwater	Magnuson	Wiley

So Mr. BRIDGES' amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on agreeing to the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, there have been some very spectacular votes on the amendments involving the questions whether we wish to give aid to nations which are on the verge of the Russian orbit or to nations which are neutral 90 percent of the time and favorable to the Russians. The Senate by an overwhelming vote has gone on record for the last, and by a small vote for the first. I think our action will come back to haunt us.

A very mysterious report has come in that there is nothing listed under military assistance—for which there is some excuse—to any nation, but there are some nations which have stood by us. Some nations, when we were fighting in Korea, sent troops. Other nations in whose territory we are building bases are cooperating, and I am confident they will stand by us.

I should like to ask some questions of the responsible Senators in charge of this authorization bill. The House of Representatives adopted an amendment allowing \$48 million for military assistance to Spain. I should like to know whether Spain is being scuttled in this

bill or whether Spain will receive a reasonable amount. I do not want the exact figure, if it is a secret, but I should like to get an approximate figure which will show whether or not we mean what we say.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield?

Mr. BRIDGES. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I will say to the Senator from New Hampshire that Spain received very sympathetic consideration in the discussions held in the committee. Relative to that particular country, there certainly was no sign of animosity. There was a question, however, as to whether one particular country should be picked out and the possibility raised that other countries would have to be considered in like fashion. I can assure the Senator from New Hampshire that as to the figure agreed to by the administration and incorporated in the bill, on the one hand, and the figure of \$48 million in the House bill, there is very little difference between the two. It is understood, on the basis of the recommendations made by the administration and on the basis of discussions in the committee, that a certain sum, a very little bit smaller than the sum provided by the House, will be allocated to Spain, and that sum will be on the "not-less-than" basis.

I wish to assure the Senator that there was complete sympathy for the situation of Spain, and especially so in view of the fact that there may be some difficulties with the bases in Morocco because of the changed situation in that country in connection with the new Sultanate of Morocco.

Mr. BRIDGES. I thank the Senator from Montana.

I think the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ] wishes to ask a question, and I wish to ask concerning 2 or 3 other nations, if I may.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I am sympathetic to the suggestion made by the Senator from Montana, but I know that having sympathy for Spain does not answer the question. I should prefer to have assurance, at least, without naming the amount, if that can be done at this moment, that Spain will be taken care of. We sermonize to the world about how we are against the Communists. The only nation that ever chased Communists out of its territory was Spain.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will take my word for it—and I think I can speak for the committee—I give him every assurance that Spain is taken care of, and that the Senator's suspicions, if any, are not founded on fact.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I will take the word of the Senator, of course.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I should like to address a question with reference to Turkey, which has been a great ally of ours. How is Turkey to be treated in this bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. In reply to the Senator from New Hampshire, I will give the same answer. The figure was not publicized because of the possibility that if that were done other countries

might be publicized as well. The administration has taken good care of Turkey, and I can assure the Senator that the Turks will receive special consideration in the discussions held in the committee on this particular measure.

Mr. BRIDGES. Now, with reference to Formosa?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The same answer would apply.

Mr. BRIDGES. South Korea?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The same answer would apply.

Mr. BRIDGES. Guatemala?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There I think the answer is that we did not go as far as did the House. The House allowed \$10 million above the administration's estimate. The Senate allowed \$5 million for Guatemala and an additional \$5 million for all of Latin America, a part of which could be allocated to Guatemala.

I point out that the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] had an amendment accepted providing \$35 million for use in all the countries of Latin-America. So I would say that, in general, Guatemala will come out, as the result of this bill, with about the same as was provided by in the House.

Mr. BRIDGES. What about Greece?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Greece, the same as Turkey, Formosa, South Korea, and Spain.

Mr. BRIDGES. What the distinguished Senator from Montana has stated in answer to my questions about some of the countries which have been our true allies gives me encouragement and some satisfaction. I know he speaks with sincerity. I hope he speaks the minds of the rest of the committee, or a majority of the committee, as he must, because of the figures agreed to here. That gives us some satisfaction, when we have been wandering around in the dark on some of the other situations on which we voted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I assure the Senator from New Hampshire that I speak for the committee in my answers.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, at the close of this debate, I cannot remain mute and not say the words which come from my heart.

I, in part, represent the sovereign State of Idaho in the United States Senate. I want to be able to go home, look my constituents in the eye, and say that I have done my best to represent them properly in connection with the debate which has taken place and the votes which have been recorded during the past 2 days.

I should like to ask how we can say that the United States Senate has been fair to the American people. I know about the high level of secrecy in the Committee on Foreign Relations. Perhaps I shall never know about it more intimately. I happen, however, to occupy a very strategic position on the Committee on Armed Services, which does not have quite so much secrecy, but is a committee whose members receive abuse and ridicule when they seek to give to the Air Force of the United States approximately \$900 million more

than was recommended, so as to make the Air Force strong.

Regardless of my political future, I shall not sit here silent when I see my colleagues deliberately vote to give the taxpayers' money to Tito the Communist, who a blind man and a fool would know has quit us.

Nor shall I sit here and remain mute while my colleagues vote to give aid to Mr. Nehru, whose record is painted as lily white, though every person who can read knows where he stands.

Why has not something been said about Mr. Nasser and about the disaster plan of foreign aid, which has been in existence for longer than the junior Senator from Idaho has been in the Senate?

I have seen the smirking and smiling when some of the votes have been taken. With my own eyes I have seen the dedicated internationalists vote to give away in foreign aid the money of the taxpayers of the United States which is so urgently needed at home. I have seen them smile when by their votes they defeated the amendment of the great Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], who asked that aid to Nehru be reduced.

I do not like what has happened. If any of my colleagues want to speak on the subject in Idaho, I shall be glad to discuss it with them. But how, when I go home, am I to meet and answer my own constituents, including the small-business men? There is not a Senator in the Chamber who is not in the same situation. How am I going to answer the small-business man who must fill out an application for a loan, so that he can continue in his small business, so that he can exist and can support his family and educate his children?

Where is the small business loan application bill today? It is pigeonholed and forgotten.

Mr. President, I hope my colleagues are right; I hope I am wrong. They have not hesitated to give aid to Tito and Nehru, when people in Idaho and Oklahoma and other States are begging for a little financial aid.

There is a little agency called the Farmers' Home Administration, which represents the farming community. Every Senator has had the same problem as has been presented to the junior Senator from Idaho. The veterans of the Korean war, who gave their best in the fight for freedom, came home and finally received land from the Farmers' Home Administration, but a little later they were faced with foreclosure by the Government of the United States.

Mr. President, I wonder when all this will end.

We are said to be brilliant by reason of the secrecy which prevails in this body. Perhaps we are. Perhaps I am ignorant. But I am going to let the chips fall where they may. I am going to let fortune turn the wheel. Then we shall see who is right and who is wrong.

I wonder why it is that I have listened in the past 5 years to great statesmen, some on the Committee on Foreign Relations, who as recently as 1953 said that that year would be the end of mutual security and foreign aid. After 7 years,

if the foreign countries have not become strong, they will never become strong. I say it is about time for Congress to do a little thinking for America.

Like the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], I will vote for anyone who is our ally, but I will not vote for a Communist who is out to cut our throats and destroy our liberty.

Nor will I vote aid for Mr. Nehru, who is a neutral sitting it out, when he ought to take a stand one way or the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Idaho has expired.

Mr. WELKER. May I have 2 minutes more?

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 additional minutes to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. WELKER. Mr. President, I was in the Senate in the days of the great Ken Wherry, when he was the minority leader, and when the Senate considered and debated the question of furnishing of wheat to India. I was here at the time when we were begging for monosite sand. India at that time had the largest known deposits of monosite sand in the world. Did any Senator ever see any monosite sand from India in repayment for the wheat which the American taxpayers, those whom we represent, gave to India? Oh, no, they did not. We have no time, I guess, to think of America. We have no time to think of the Farm Home Administration.

What has happened to the Aiken-Welker bill and other bills to liberalize the Farmers' Home Administration?

When the farmers of the United States read the mutual security bill, they are going to wonder what kind of representation they have in Congress.

Senators can smirk and smile all they wish, but so long as I represent, in part, the sovereign State of Idaho I will never be hoodwinked about anything so potentially dangerous as the action we are soon to take.

When, O when, are we going to realize that we are a bankrupt nation; that we have spent ourselves into bankruptcy? We are paying more than \$8 billion a year in interest alone for this drunken spending spree, the end of which I do not think I will ever see. But so long as I am here and so long as the American people are forgotten, count me as voting "nay" on bills of this character.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I have only a brief comment to make on the bill before final action is taken. All of us have given serious and deep thought to how we should vote on this all-important measure. Today, yesterday, and the day before I have heard on the floor as penetrating and careful debate on foreign aid as I have ever heard in this body. This holds true both of those supporting the bill as reported

by the committee, and those offering amendments to the bill.

I believe it is fair to characterize the discussion as having been one of great worry on both sides. There have been expressions of doubt, of hesitation, and of misgiving by almost every speaker.

In these doubts and in these misgivings I share.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations [Mr. GEORGE], that world statesman who has an unerring instinct for the jugular, stated our problem and summed up the entire discussion yesterday when he said:

In the past few years there has been a breakdown in the understanding of the so-called foreign-aid program. Since those days when the American people willingly gave of their goods and services, to help Europe rebuild after the war, through the Marshall plan, the Turkish-aid program, and the Greece-aid program, there has been a deterioration of their understanding of the need for continuation of the mutual-assistance program. There is a deep skepticism among many of our people.

I frankly share that skepticism, Mr. President. From the very beginning when the President, in the spring of this year, asked for a new authorization of nearly \$5 billion, I have felt that the administration was not taking into account how much public opinion, not only here at home but also abroad, was being affected by the changing situation in the world.

I believe that the administration has paid little attention to the obvious fact that foreign aid was in fact being reappraised throughout the entire world.

The Congress is aware that the whole subject of foreign aid must be reconsidered. We know that in fact the administration has talked for some time about reconsidering it. We are aware that in the light of the new world situation, becoming more obvious every day, there must be a new foreign-aid policy.

There would have been a far happier tone to our debate this week if the administration had some months ago come to the Congress in frankness and in candor and had told us that foreign aid is going to be revised and that in truth such revision was already underway. If it had told us that, and had also stated that existing programs should not be disturbed, since it is impossible to withdraw abruptly from our worldwide commitments, I believe there would have been more trust and more confidence expressed in this body this week.

Mr. President, I am strongly convinced that as responsible men we should not and we must not strip the gears or wreck the machinery of existing foreign-aid programs because we have little faith that serious thought is being given to the future of this program.

Our skepticism, as it has been expressed here in the past 2 days, is in accord with opinion here at home and opinion throughout the world. I think our attitude can be fairly described as caused by a failure in administration leadership, a failure, as columnist Walter Lippmann has phrased it, "to argue the case for foreign aid in terms which are relevant and convincing."

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. Lippmann's column from the Washington Post of May 31, 1956, be placed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Yet we are faced now with the necessity of acting. We have no intentions of reducing the military security of the United States and of our allies. Then what should we do?

In view of our dissatisfaction, it appears to me, Mr. President, that we should do two things:

First, we should support the proposal of the Foreign Relations Committee, so ably led by that distinguished and wise statesman, the senior Senator from Georgia.

Second, we should approve a critical reexamination of foreign aid and foreign policy by the Foreign Relations Committee—which we, in effect, have done today by rejection of a counter proposal.

There is no blinking the fact, Mr. President, that the American people are not convinced that today's program serves America's national interest. The American people are doubtful that that interest is any longer served by continued economic assistance to many nations and peoples far from our shores. The administration has done little to allay these genuine doubts. Therefore, it is imperative that we seek to do so.

It would be my hope that a comprehensive, careful, and thorough reappraisal of our entire foreign-aid program will be made during the next year by the Foreign Relations Committee, aided and abetted by distinguished experts in the field of foreign policy, and called in as consultants to the committee. This appraisal would be in our hands, so that next year we may take intelligent action for the long term down the long road.

But it is vitally important, Mr. President, that we not destroy faith in the foreign-aid program in the intervening months. So I shall cast my vote in support of the committee. I shall do so reluctantly, but I shall do so in the knowledge that this is no moment in history to destroy the faith of the world in our leadership.

Therefore, I personally prefer to regard the present bill as in the nature of an interim authorization. I shall regard the appropriation bill to support this authorization as an interim appropriation.

Our national interest will not at this time best be served by completely ignoring the recommendations of our President, of the Joint Chiefs, and the other officials of the executive branch concerned with our foreign policy. I do not think that we can also afford to ignore the considered, mature, and the expert judgment of the majority in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

And we cannot afford to ignore, Mr. President, the cry that would go up throughout the world that once again the United States has furled its flag of world leadership, and unfurled once

more that tattered and bedraggled banner of isolationism which has served us and the peoples of this earth so badly in the past. We cannot indulge ourselves in the luxury of this danger, as once we could have with impunity. Our action today, if it is unfavorable to foreign aid, will be cleverly twisted and turned by our enemies in every world capital.

Just today the Senate adopted a conference report and insisted on increasing the strength of our Air Force.

In my judgment, this was a wise and statesmanlike precaution. I suggest that we cannot afford the contrast between that action and in the same week contribute to the destruction of our foreign aid program, however much we may have misgivings and doubts about that program.

Already the cry is echoing around the earth that once again America is "going it alone". This, we all know, is untrue, but it is not enough that we happen to know it is untrue. It is imperative, I think, that we reassure our allies and the neutral nations that once and forever this Nation has accepted its role of world leadership.

I shall, therefore, cast my vote in favor for the bill as reported by the committee.

EXHIBIT 1

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)

WOODEN LEADERSHIP

It is not in the least surprising that Congress is showing so much opposition to this year's request for foreign aid. Ever since the middle of March, when the President asked for a new authorization of nearly five billions, it has been plain enough that he and his advisers were not taking into account how much world public opinion, including American, was being affected by the changing world situation.

The administration has put forward its request for another and a bigger authorization, using the same old slogans that have been doing duty year after year. It has taken no serious notice of the fact that foreign aid, both military and civilian, is undergoing a revolutionary reappraisal throughout the world. It has treated this great development as not strictly relevant to the business before Congress.

Congress has reacted to this lack of plainness and candor. It knows that the whole subject of foreign aid has to be reconsidered. It knows that the administration is in fact beginning to reconsider it. It knows that the administration has not yet reached many definite conclusions as to how, in the light of the new world situation, to form a sound foreign aid policy.

Then Congress finds that the new money it is being asked to vote is to be used to finance the flow of military assistance, not this year and not next year, but in 1958 and in 1959. Knowing that the strategic planning of NATO and of our other alliances may be seriously revised in the next 2 years, Congress is in no mood to authorize large funds to be used 2 or 3 years hence. "The Congress," said the chairman of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Mr. RICHARDS, "may well regard the pending mutual security bill as only an interim measure." As there are nearly 2 years' funds already in the pipeline, the committee felt that after cutting the authorization by over a billion dollars, "the sums recommended in this bill are ample until we know more about the direction in which the program will move."

The administration would have done well to listen to those who advised it to go to Congress saying that foreign aid was going to be revised, that while the revision was going on the existing programs should not be disturbed, and that as and when new programs were worked out, Congress would be told all about them. On that kind of submission, the President would in fact have been asking Congress not to approve a program that is out of date, but to trust him while a new program is being worked out. He might well have gotten such a vote of confidence.

In reacting as it has reacted the House Foreign Affairs Committee is moving with, not counter to, the tides of opinion in Western Europe. When it voted to reduce military aid by a billion dollars it did not in the least believe that it was voting to reduce the military security of the United States and of its allies. It was in the same mood as are the Germans, who do not want to conscript the promised German divisions, as the French who have now moved virtually all their infantry to north Africa, as the British, who are beginning to think about abolishing conscription.

It is the mood of people who do not want to waste their time and their money preparing not for the next war but for the last war.

The attitude of Congress is the American expression of the same mood which we are thinking about abroad when we talk of the decline of interest in NATO. I do not believe that the deep cause of this loss of interest is due to the new look of Soviet policy. The deep cause is that the higher leadership of NATO, as it reflects itself in the requests to the governments, has not kept abreast of the revolution in the military art. The loss of interest is due to a loss of belief in the realism of NATO's strategical conceptions.

If we are wise, we shall not regard the action of the committee as merely a relapse into isolationism and know-nothingism. Insofar as there has been such a relapse, it is due to a failure in leadership—a failure to argue the case for foreign aid in terms which are relevant and convincing.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I wish to associate myself with the views expressed by the majority leader. Like him, I shall vote for the bill with reluctance. I am going to go one step further than the majority leader did. I am glad I shall be a member of the committee where the next action will be taken. As a member of that committee, I intend to vote for lesser amounts.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KNOWLAND. We have come to the end of the road with a very important piece of legislation. On it there have, of course, been differences of opinion on both sides of the aisle. The administration, of course, has not abdicated, nor does it intend to abdicate, the world leadership responsibilities which this Nation has. Had we cast aside at any time the responsibilities of leadership in the world, there is but one power that could have picked up the torch; and it would have engulfed the world. I refer, of course, to the Soviet Union and the international system of communism it represents.

Mr. President, the present administration came into power only 3 years ago. It found the world in a state of war. After winning World War II, in 1945, when we were associated with our allies, and when men of good will everywhere had hoped that we and our allies might live in peace with honor in a free world of free men, there rose in the world a power—the Soviet Union—which was determined to destroy human freedom.

As a result of wartime agreements at Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, 500 million people who once had been free passed behind the Communist Iron Curtain. When President Eisenhower's administration came into power, we found ourselves involved in a stalemated war in Korea, which had been going on for a period of time. The United States alone carried a heavy share of the burden of that war. Approximately 90 percent of the manpower supplied by the United Nations in that war was supplied by the United States. More than 90 percent of the resources supplied by the United Nations in that war was provided by the United States. The little Republic of Korea had contributed approximately 600,000 men; the United States had contributed at a single time more than 500,000 men, and we had rotated more than a million men through Korea. All the powers associated with us in the United Nations had contributed only 45,000 men. Because of certain restrictions placed upon us, the war had become a stalemate. The present administration brought peace with honor in that area. However, in the final analysis there is not a peace in the full sense of the word, because we still have only an armistice. The Chinese Communists have not consented to the unification of Korea.

In the period of time since this administration has come into power, only approximately 20 million people in North Vietnam have passed beyond the Iron Curtain, as compared with the more than 500 million people who passed behind the Iron Curtain in the 5 years prior to that time. The Indochina war was raging when this administration came into power.

Mr. President, these problems are not partisan ones. When the war broke out in Korea, Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle supported the then President of the United States. There are also in the Senate at this time Members who supported the Greek-Turkish aid program under the prior administration, and Members who supported the Marshall plan, doing so because they believed it was important to rehabilitate the war-torn world.

Mr. President, I think the American people can be highly pleased and gratified that at the helm of this country today there sits a great American, Dwight Eisenhower, who is devoted to the cause of peace with honor, who is interested in preserving peace for this generation and for future generations of Americans, and who has given leadership to the world in this troubled period. I hope we shall never let narrow partisanship mar our foreign policy in the future.

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute, tonight—I would not want this oppor-

tunity to pass without doing so—to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who has devoted many years of his life to service in the Senate of the United States and who, as the respected and distinguished leader of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has led the fight on the floor of the Senate for the mutual-security bill sponsored by the administration. Some of the rest of us have been pleased to join with him in trying to bring through this legislative battle a piece of proposed legislation which I believe to be important for the future of our country and the preservation of a free world of free men.

Mr. President, we owe our thanks to Senators on both sides of the aisle who have been prepared to join together, and who have joined together, not as partisans, not seeking any political advantage, but as Americans determined that we will maintain this free Republic and carry on our part in present-day civilization.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on the question of final passage of the bill, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the senior Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONROE in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to express my deep appreciation of the remarks which have been made by the majority leader and the minority leader, and I also wish to express my personal appreciation of the way they have helped in this work. In addition, I wish to give full credit to the Foreign Relations Committee, and to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], its chairman.

Mr. President, I now seek to obtain unanimous consent to have a memorandum printed in the RECORD before the debate on this bill is closed. One of the big problems which has faced us during this debate and during the study our committee has been the problem of unexpended balances under the mutual security program. It is a very complicated subject, and I admit that for a long time I was completely baffled by it. The chairman of the committee asked me to make a study of it, for the benefit of the Senate, in connection with this debate.

Therefore, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the RECORD a memorandum, based on a study I have had made by the staff of the Foreign Relations Committee, and also by my own staff, covering the unexpended balances—a subject which has disturbed us very much. The memorandum covers the military and the nonmilitary phases of the unexpended-balances issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—although I do not intend to object—let me say that I think the matter to which the Senator from New Jersey has just referred is the crux of the question before us, insofar as I am concerned.

Under my reservation of the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from New Jersey what the figures show regarding the total unexpended balances.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. I shall be glad to answer, if I have time in which to do so.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, the memorandum shows that as of June 30, 1956, the military unexpended balances under the Department of Defense amount to \$5,109.4 million, or slightly in excess of \$5 billion; and also that there are unexpended balances in the International Cooperation Administration for military assistance and direct forces support. The total of military unexpended balances amounts to \$5,059.1 million.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is in excess of \$5 billion?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Yes, it is slightly in excess of \$5 billion. But the obligated or reserved funds in the military assistance program are estimated at \$4,863.6 million, and that includes \$39.7 million of obligated funds under the International Cooperation Administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, this means that the total of unexpended unobligated funds in the military assistance program is estimated at \$195.5 million as of June 30, 1956.

The memorandum shows how these obligated balances are assigned, and how the unobligated balances are arrived at. The memorandum also deals with the nonmilitary unexpended balances, which constitute a very much smaller amount, all told; in that category there are \$1,818.6 million unexpended balances but only \$146.9 million of that is unobligated.

The memorandum also states what we mean by lead time. I have tried to list these figures in such a way as to explain this very complicated problem, which to me was inexplicable for a long time, but which we have worked out.

I feel it important that this information be placed in the RECORD, for the benefit of the entire Senate. I hope it will be extremely helpful next fall or later next year, when we study the entire problem. I hope this information will help improve the system of accounting. I admit that all of us were at first baffled by this issue. I hope the material I am now submitting for the RECORD will help improve the system of accounting.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, certainly I have no objection to having the figures printed in the RECORD. I had hoped they would be available earlier in the debate. Of course, I am very glad that the figures have been prepared by that time at least. My own feeling is—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota has reserved the right to object, and is making a speech, for which time will have to be yielded to him by the majority leader or the minority leader.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. President, whenever we have had this annual discussion of the subject, ever since the Marshall plan was first inaugurated, I have listened. We have heard something of the same story as to the purpose to be served, how it would be accomplished, and why it was necessary that a certain figure had to be authorized.

I do not question the purposes of the program, but I do question the amounts. I feel that the unobligated balances are so large that, coupled with the proposed appropriation, they represent a larger amount than should be made available for this purpose. Therefore I shall vote against the bill, not because I am opposed to its purposes, but because I believe it would be better administered if there were not so much funds made available that it is practically impossible for even a distinguished Senator like the Senator from New Jersey to present the figures without saying he is confused. We would have better administration and a better program if the figures were more sharply defined, and if the amount were not so large.

I withdraw the objection to the printing in the RECORD of the memorandum submitted by the Senator from New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Jersey?

There being no objection, the memorandum submitted by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ESTIMATED UNEXPENDED BALANCES IN THE MUTUAL SECURITY PROGRAM AS OF JUNE 30, 1956

I. CONTENTIONS TO BE MET

1. There has been opposition to appropriation or authorization of further sizable funds for the military-assistance program due to the existence of large so-called unexpended balances in the program.
2. It has been suggested that these unexpended balances are sufficient to run the program for 2 years at the current annual rate of expenditure. (Approximately 2.5 billion per annum.)

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order to clarify any discussion of the unexpended balance situation, it is necessary initially to define a few of the terms involved with some precision.

A. Unexpended balances: Includes all funds previously authorized and appropriated which have not been expended, i. e., payment has not been made for goods delivered. This total at any time will include three different classes of funds.

1. Obligated funds: Funds which have been utilized for the negotiation of contracts with suppliers and manufacturers for end items or services which have not as yet been delivered. Represents commitment of funds in strict technical compliance with section 1311 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955. The technical obligation of the funds occurs when the military-assistance funds are cited in a contract.

2. Reserved funds: Funds which have been allocated to pay for equipment ordered from our own military services. The services utilize their own funds in contracting for such items, or for the purchase of replacement items for their own use—replacing items in stock which will be made available to the military-assistance programs upon the receipt of appropriate replacement items.

Such contracts placed by the military services are made on the basis of reserved funds in the military-assistance program. Although such reservations are not technically obligations, a reservation has substantially the same effect as an obligation since, pursuant to statutory direction, funds held in reservation cease to be available for other purposes. (Sec. 108, Mutual Security Appropriation Act, 1956.)

3. Unobligated funds: Funds for which obligations or reservations have not been made.

III. MILITARY UNEXPENDED BALANCES, JUNE 30, 1956

1. Amount unexpended: Mr. President, the Defense Department estimates that the total of unexpended balances of military funds under the Defense Department on June 30, 1956, would be \$5,019.4 million or slightly over \$5 billion.

There also will be \$31.2 million of unexpended balances for military assistance under the International Cooperation Administration, \$6.1 million under ICA in military assistance for common-use items, and \$2.4 million under ICA for Direct Forces Support.

Therefore, including these military funds under ICA, the unexpended balances on June 30, 1956, for the total military assistance program comes to \$5,059.1 million.

2. Amount of unexpended balances obligated or reserved: Mr. President, the total of obligated or reserved funds in the military assistance program is estimated to be \$4,863.6 million as of June 30, 1956. This includes \$39.7 million obligated funds under the International Cooperation Administration.

Therefore, Mr. President, the total of unobligated funds in the military-assistance program is estimated at \$195.5 million as of June 30, 1956. All of this figure comes under the Department of Defense. ICA will have no unobligated funds for military assistance as of that date.

3. Mr. President, these unexpended balances can be broken down as follows:

- (a) German program plus multilateral commitments for infrastructure, military headquarters, etc., \$1.2 billion.
- (b) All other programs, \$3.8 billion.
- (1) Air Force equipment orders (approximate), \$2 billion.
- (2) Army equipment orders (approximate) \$1 billion.
- (3) Navy equipment orders (approximate) \$0.5 billion.
- (4) Miscellaneous (nonregional, special, etc.) \$0.3 billion.

4. Thus, the total of unexpended balances anticipated for the military assistance program for June 30, 1956, is almost completely obligated or reserved towards the payment, upon delivery, for specific quantities of specific types of equipment for specific countries.

IV. NONMILITARY UNEXPENDED BALANCES, JUNE 30, 1956

1. Amount unexpended: It is estimated in the committee report, page 51, that the total of unexpended balances of nonmilitary funds on June 30, 1956 will be \$1,818.6 million. This figure can be found under "Other mutual security programs."

2. Amount obligated: Of these nonmilitary unexpended balances, the total of obligated funds is estimated to be \$1,671.7 million as of June 30, 1956.

3. Amount unobligated: Therefore, Mr. President, the total amount of unobligated nonmilitary funds as of June 30, 1956 will be \$146.9 million.

In the case of nonmilitary assistance, the unobligated balance is largely accounted for by \$90 million in the President's Asian Development Fund (which was originally intended for a 3-year period) and by \$45.3 million for Palestine refugees. It has not

been possible to obligate this money because of the political situation in this area.

V. LEAD TIME

A crucial consideration in the question of unexpended balances is that of lead time in the delivery of equipment, i. e. the amount of time that it takes to obtain delivery of specific equipment to specific countries after authorization and appropriation have been made.

Here again, there are various elements involved. In addition to the production lead times for the assembling of equipment, there is a necessary administrative lead time to insure the orderly pursuit of the objectives of the military assistance program.

1. Administrative lead time: Once the Congress has passed the authorization and appropriation bills for the mutual security program, the military assistance program must be reprogrammed, i. e., the sums actually authorized and appropriated to the program must be reconciled with the amounts requested, and the programs re-evaluated to whatever changed conditions may have developed between the preparation of the program and the final action by Congress. (It should be obvious that there is necessarily considerable time between the initial preparation of authorization requests and the final appropriation of the money—as in all budget preparations—for instance, the preparation for fiscal year 1958 is already being initiated with the military assistance advisory groups in the field.)

Various persons dealing with the administration of this program have testified before the Senate and House committees that the "reprogramming" phase consumes at least 6 months. That the necessary consultations with the personnel in the various countries, the area field commanders, the State Department, the ICA, the Joint Chiefs, and the like preclude the availability of the funds appropriated for any fiscal year before January 1.

Thus there is about a 6-month administrative lead time in the obligation and expenditure of appropriated funds in any fiscal year. In addition, once the reprogramming has been completed, and the needs for military equipment have been finally determined within the funds available, then there is substantial production lead time prior to the delivery of any equipment.

2. Production lead time: It is almost impossible for funds appropriated in a fiscal year to result in the delivery and receipt of equipment during that same fiscal year. Even the shortest production lead time items cannot be delivered prior to the expiration of the fiscal year after the reprogramming stage has been completed. With longer production lead-time items such as aircraft and naval ships, production lead time plus administrative lead time consumes up to 2 and 3 years.

3. Delivery lead time: Furthermore, in most instances there is encountered a delivery lead time. Since the funds do not become expended until actual delivery to the docks for overseas shipment there is additional time consumed before the actual expenditure of funds. Shipment to appropriate ports plus time consumed in processing paper work for payment may add several weeks to total lead time.

4. Lead time and fiscal year 1957 appropriations: With all these considerations of lead time, an illustration of the nature of the unexpended balances can be made with the fiscal year 1957 appropriations. Of the total of approximately \$3 billion appropriation which the administration requested for the military assistance program, only \$0.4 billion was estimated for expenditure during the fiscal year 1957. Practically all of that total would be consumed in fixed charges, direct forces support, training, administration, and packing, crating, handling, and transporta-

tion of end-items delivered under prior year appropriations.

Of the remainder of the requested fiscal year 1957 appropriation, \$1.1 billion would be expended in fiscal year 1958, and \$1.5 billion, half of the total requested, would remain unexpended until equipment deliveries and payment in fiscal year 1959.

VI. UNEXPENDED BALANCES AND MILITARY PLANNING

The great bulk of the unexpended balances actually represents equipment ordered, in the process of production and release, committed to specific countries, but not yet delivered and paid for.

These funds are definitely committed to particular programs. As Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense E. Perkins McGuire testified, "In most cases our allies have based their own defense and budgetary plans on the assumption that the material and services in these programs would be received from the United States. Thus these items are not available to any substantial degree for redistribution as a consequence of failure to reappropriate needed unobligated balances or failure to appropriate required amounts of new funds."

Furthermore, the equipment represented by the unexpended balances is not necessarily transferable from one country to another because of the special character of that equipment. That is, equipment which is under contract for production and delivery to NATO would probably have little use in meeting the military needs in Indochina, and likewise vice versa.

Reliance upon unexpended balances to carry the program forward, without sufficient additional authorization for fiscal year 1957, can only result in a definite lag during fiscal year 1958 and fiscal year 1959. The military-assistance program needs new obligational authority now in order to insure that appropriate levels of delivery and assistance will be flowing to our allies during those fiscal years. We cannot repair this situation with increased authorization during future years. Contracts must be placed during fiscal year 1957 in order to anticipate inevitable lead time in deliveries for fiscal years 1958 and 1959.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I am sorry I cannot vote for the bill. I would like to have voted for what appeared to be a reasonable foreign-aid bill. It has always been my feeling that since the Korean war, during which time we were appropriating as much as \$7 million a year for foreign-aid purposes, we should have been reducing the amounts appropriated for that purpose.

Nothing that has happened during the past year would, in my judgment, justify the Congress in appropriating more money this year than was appropriated last year or the year before. This year we are appropriating \$1,500,000,000 more, by action of the Senate, than was appropriated the previous year. That is an increase of almost 60 percent, which is a reversal of the trend. It is a move in the direction of disposing of much more of the resources of our people in the foreign-aid program. It seems to me that we should reduce the program, rather than increase it by 60 percent.

Senators know that since 1953 we have been steadily reducing appropriations, and steadily reducing carried-

over balances. Now we are reversing the trend.

I hope that some day within the next 10 years we may get this program down to a figure which the American people will not resent. The American people feel that we are spending far too much on this program, and I think they are right in that feeling. So long as additional funds are to be appropriated, and so much money is to be carried forward, I feel that I must vote against the bill.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER].

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as one who would not vote a thin dime for donation programs unless he felt that they were in the interest of the security of the United States, I wish to say that I am very much disturbed by the political undertones of certain statements made here tonight with regard to what I approach as a completely non-partisan and unpartisan action in the interest of the security of the country.

I have had the honor and the privilege, and sometimes the burden, of serving on the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 10 years. I was a member of the committee in the 80th Congress, when the so-called Marshall Plan was inaugurated. That was a Republican Congress, which authorized the requests of a Democratic administration to spend vast sums of money in an attempt to help in the reconstruction of a war-torn Europe.

I had been in many countries of Europe at that time, and I visited many others later. I saw what I thought was the need for a humane, humanitarian approach to the reconstruction of the economy of those countries, not as a donation program, but in the self-interest of America and a free society.

It was not the Republican Party or the Republicans who gave China to the Russians. It was not the Republican Party or the Republican leadership which put the Kremlin in possession of world dominion, a position in which today it controls more than a third of the population of the world. But today, in this administration, it is the responsibility of the Republican Party to pick up the pieces of the debris which were left as a result of those ill-advised settlements near the close and at the close of World War II.

We are not dodging or shirking that responsibility, at least so far as the leadership is concerned. I am willing to assume it, unpopular as it may be, and unpopular as may be the taxes which are necessary as a result of those past mistakes.

So tonight I dislike to hear the connotation and the insinuation that this is a Republican mistake that we are trying to support. I think it is the responsibility of the American people to act in the best interests of America and of future generations. The only excuse I have for voting for great expenditures of money abroad is that it is in the interest of the security of the United States and tomorrow's generation.

I am sad tonight that political undertones have crept into the excuses for

voting for the bill. We are all concerned about our country, its future, and its security.

I have voted in various ways. I have voted in times past to eliminate the giveaway programs. Today I suggest that in this bill 75 percent of the advances which we make in the so-called giveaway programs are on the basis of repayment. That is a victory for those of us who do not believe in giving away money in a charitable gesture, but rather putting it on the basis that those who receive it will repay it at some future date.

This is not a giveaway program. It is in contrast with the original programs, which gave away vast sums of money without any responsibility on the recipients to pay it back.

This evening I earnestly hope that the Senate will not undertake to assert that this is a political manipulation on the part of those of us who vote for the bill, in spite of the mistakes of the present administration. The Senators who vote for it should vote for it because it is the continuance of a program which was started by a combination of Democratic executive leadership and Republican legislative authority. It started in the 80th Congress. I hope that we shall not adopt an attitude either for or against the bill for reasons of political advantage. I hope we shall be big enough, as a country and as a legislative body, to see that, whichever way we vote—and many Senators will vote against this bill, and many will vote for it—we shall be voting for what we believe to be the long-range security and the best interests of our country, and of tomorrow's generation.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I fear that the country will be shocked at the charges we have heard, to the effect that this administration is a failure. I certainly was shocked to hear that our domestic policies have been failures, and that our foreign policy has also failed.

Mr. President, what is failure? Does the fact that our present foreign trade is the greatest in peacetime history and is steadily increasing indicate failure?

Is the fact that we have not been engaged in war and that there has been no major war anywhere in the world for 3 years evidence of failure?

Does the fact that we are enjoying the greatest prosperity we have ever known, either in wartime or in peacetime, warrant the charge of failure?

Does the fact that during the past 3 years we have made great cuts in our taxes and have balanced our budget and put our fiscal system in a sound condition constitute a failure?

Mr. President, if this be failure, may this kind of failure last forever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives reasonable technical assistance to underdeveloped countries to help them to help themselves. I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives military as-

sistance to those nations which have manifested a willingness to stand by the free world in any possible conflict with the Soviet bloc. I should like to vote for an aid bill which gives economic assistance to countries like South Korea and Formosa, which are incapable of self-support.

However, I must confess that the concoction of international slumgullion embodied in the pending bill is more than I can support.

In order to vote for technical assistance and economic aid to those countries which are in need of those things and which are friends of America, I must, under the pending bill, vote for economic aid for countries which have constantly manifested their hostility to this country.

In order to vote for military aid to those nations which have shown their willingness to stand by the free world in any possible conflict with the Soviet bloc, I must vote for military aid for one nation whose leader stated a short time ago that he would never again be separated from Russia, and I must vote for military aid to other nations which, according to the sworn testimony which has been adduced before a committee of which I am a member, are selling strategic materials to Russia and to the other countries of the Soviet bloc—materials which can be used to destroy the lives of American boys in the event of hostilities between America and the Soviet bloc.

That is just too much for my conscience to stand. I shall not vote for the bill for those reasons.

The bill, as the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has pointed out, increases the appropriation for foreign aid in the 12th year after the end of the Second World War over the appropriation for the 11th year by \$1½ billion. It does this at a time when those in charge of the administration of the foreign-aid program already have unexpended funds totaling \$6,800 million at their disposal.

The appropriation authorized by this bill would take at least \$55 million out of the pockets of the taxpayers of my State of North Carolina at a time when my State has great difficulty in finding enough money with which to educate its children and defray its other necessary expenses. A part of that money would be given to Tito and to countries which are selling strategic materials to Russia. That is too much for me.

Although I have the greatest respect for the judgment of the very genial and able majority leader, I cannot share his feeling that the defeat of this bill would cause any injury to us or the free world. I believe if we did the intelligent thing tonight by voting down this bill, the administration would forthwith come in with an intelligent bill that we could conscientiously support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it seems to me that during a good deal of the

debate of the last hour or two we have lost sight of one very important factor which should be high in our minds as we come to cast our decisive vote on this important bill.

I think the important fact is that we are debating this bill at a time when we are nearing the half-year mark in the fourth successive year of peace in the world, certainly a peace so far as all our American soldiers are concerned.

I do not know, and I am sure no other human being knows for sure, the precise formula by which peace is made and by which peace is preserved. Undoubtedly, preserving world peace results from a combination of contributing factors.

At least peace must have some association with the things which we are doing concurrently at the time when we have peace. There must be some relationship between peace and the political and military leadership supplied by the United States as the recognized leader of the free world. Presumably there is a relationship between peace and NATO, which has tended to bind together and to keep going in a common direction a great many of our associates in Western Europe, and the united strength of their armed forces and fabricating plants.

Presumably there is also a relationship between peace and the mutual security program, which provides for countries all over the world some kind of connection, some kind of relationship with the United States and with the other free countries of the world, so we continue moving together, in an economic sense and in a military sense, as a common phalanx of freedom against aggressive world communism.

As for me, I am thinking tonight of what a noncontroversial Republican said a long time ago. He was a Republican by the name of Abraham Lincoln. He said he could never determine which leg of a three-legged stool was most important, because if you knock off any leg the stool falls to the ground.

Perhaps we ought to think a little bit about that tonight. We all want peace. We want it preserved. The three factors I have mentioned have been operating concurrently with our peace. Before we run the risk of kicking a leg off the stool and supplying nothing in its place, perhaps we had better run the risk of being a little bit unpopular at home by assuming our full responsibility as Senators by supporting the Secretary of State, by supporting President Eisenhower, and by supporting those in the world who are trying to march together and work together against this tremendous force of militaristic, aggressive, godless communism.

Mr. President, of course the easy vote is "no"; perhaps the popular vote is also "no." There is always much appeal in the persuasive suggestion that we spend this money on ourselves rather than in this global effort to help strengthen others to work with us and to stand with us against aggressive communism. But, sir, peace is a going concern in the world today and our great President, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who did so much to make and keep it a going concern, tells us he needs this authorization bill to hold the line for peace. Who among us

who might vote "no" can better promote a program for peace than our President who solemnly assures us he needs this tool to continue and complete the task? Who among us who might vote "no" would assume the blame for war if defeat of this measure signals the world that collective security as a concept for the free world has thus been killed? Mr. President, by my vote tonight I refuse to expand the risk of war or to decrease the hope for peace, reluctant though I am to vote for the full figure of this bill. If I err tonight, as all humans must and do, I want my error to be on the side of voting too much rather than too little for a program which has helped preserve the peace.

I think the money item in this bill is too big. I say to you now, as a member of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, that I expect to vote for substantial reductions in this bill when it comes to the appropriations. But tonight we now face the choice that we either vote for all of it or none of it. We vote, in my opinion, for too little or too much. We now must vote for all of it or none of it. We now must vote to stay in or get out. I would rather vote to authorize spending a little too much tonight for peace, than run the risk of voting a great deal too little for peace. I prefer an economical peace but I prefer an expensive peace, even, as against risking the world fall-apart that would kick off another war.

Since we now have no alternative, we will do well to pass this authorization bill; we will do well to present it to the Appropriations Committee, and there make the careful, scrutinizing reductions which I am sure are possible and which I believe will have the votes to effectuate.

The difficulty is, Mr. President, if we vote "no" tonight, where do we go? We cannot just walk out of the world and slam the door and look up into space. We are still in the world. There is no other able and proper world leader to take our place. Unless we can provide some other device, some other peace-preserving program, some other tactic, another leg to take the place of the one on the footstool of peace that we would kick out, and thus destroy the only peace program which we have, it seems to me, Mr. President, we are forced tonight perhaps to vote for a little too much money in authorizations, so that we can vote the right amount when appropriation time comes along. It is hard to estimate the proper dollar sign for peace or the full cost of war, Mr. President. But to vote "no" now is to scrap a program associated with our peace without supplying anything in the awful vacuum which we would create.

I was in hopes, Mr. President, that Congress would appropriate some money and authorize a Hoover type commission of some kind as recommended by Senator KNOWLAND, to bring into the next session of Congress a substitute for foreign aid, a substitute for the present program. Perhaps we will get that in any event, if we adopt the resolution for the Senate to set up a study commis-

sion of its own and if the President carries out his indication that he will appoint his own executive study committee. In that event, we should come up next year with another kind of program for world cooperation, some other program for holding together the forces of peace.

But in the meantime, Mr. President, I do not want my vote to be responsible in part for running the risk of jeopardizing the peace that we have won at such great cost.

Finally, Mr. President, let me reiterate the hope that by next year we shall have developed or evolved a better, less expensive program to preserve the peace. I hope loans may supplant grants and that better, closer cooperations may be developed among the non-Communist nations of the world. I hope more can then be done by others to help themselves and to make contributions to our common cause of peace and freedom. But above all, Mr. President, I hope and pray that a year from now we shall still have our precious peace so we can argue and debate the best means of sustaining it rather than once again being compelled to spend the billions of dollars and the millions of lives which another cruel war would cost us.

Our working formula for peace, Mr. President, is far from perfect. But, sir, it is working. And we do have peace in the world. This may not be the best plan for preserving peace but it is the only plan and program for which we can vote tonight. It gives great promise of helping to sustain the peace another year. It should give us time to test and evolve other methods and new approaches. Let us not destroy what we have and what is working until we discover a new formula and provide something more than unsupported hope as the substance of our crusade for peace. If we appropriate or authorize too much, Mr. President, we can rescind or reduce our expenditures but if we authorize too little and war eventuates we cannot retrieve a single lost life or reduce the dimensions of the calamity of an atomic war by any act of Congress or by any proclamation by the President.

So, Mr. President, I shall vote "yes" despite the temptation to take the easy route of voting "no." I shall not vote to pull apart the peace which we have already spent so much to put together. I shall hope and work for a better program to preserve the peace but until we can develop it I shall not vote to kick a support out from under the stool President Eisenhower tells us he requires to meet the war threats and the Communist challenges of today.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time on the bill, provided the minority leader will yield back the time remaining to him.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Vote! Vote!

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENDER (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], who is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

Mr. MORSE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If he were present, he would vote "nay"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "nay" and the Senator from Rhode Island would vote "yea."

The Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. HUMPHREYS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "nay" and the Senator from Kentucky would vote "yea."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. LAIRD] is paired with the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from West Virginia would vote "yea" and the Senator from Washington would vote "nay."

I further announce that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], if present and voting, would vote "yea."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] is absent by leave of the Senate for the purpose of attending the Indiana Republican State convention.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] is necessarily absent, and his pair with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] has been announced previously.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senators from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON and Mr. SCHOEPFEL] are absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPFEL], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is paired with the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Arizona would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 25, as follows:

YEAS—54

Alken	Hennings	Mundt
Allott	Hickenlooper	Murray
Anderson	Hill	Neuberger
Feall	Holland	Pastore
Bennett	Humphrey,	Payne
Bridges	Minn.	Potter
Bush	Ives	Purtell
Butler	Jackson	Robertson
Case, N. J.	Johnson, Tex.	Saltonstall
Clements	Kefauver	Scott
Cotton	Kennedy	Smathers
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Kuchel	Smith, N. J.
Duff	Lehman	Sparkman
Flanders	Mansfield	Symington
Fulbright	Martin, Pa.	Thye
George	McNamara	Watkins
Gore	Millikin	
Hayden	Monroney	

NAYS—25

Barrett	Ervin	McClellan
Bible	Frear	O'Mahoney
Bricker	Hruska	Stennis
Case, S. Dak.	Johnston, S. C.	Welker
Chavez	Kerr	Williams
Curtis	Langer	Wofford
Dworshak	Long	Young
Eastland	Malone	
Ellender	McCarthy	

NOT VOTING—17

Bender	Green	Martin, Iowa
Byrd	Humphreys,	Morse
Capehart	Ky.	Neely
Carlson	Jenner	Russell
Daniel	Laird	Schoeppel
Goldwater	Magnuson	Wiley

So the bill (H. R. 11356) was passed. Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GREEN, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, and Mr. KNOWLAND conferees on the part of the Senate.

AUTHORIZATION FOR THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DURING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I submit an order and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The order will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Ordered, That notwithstanding the adjournment following today's session, the President pro tempore be authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the order.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I move that the order be agreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

CII—716

BENEFITS FOR SURVIVORS OF SERVICEMEN AND VETERANS

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 2401, H. R. 7089, to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7089) to provide benefits for the survivors of servicemen and veterans, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Texas.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance, with amendments.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF PURE FOOD AND MEAT INSPECTION ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, tomorrow, June 30, 1956, marks the historic 50th anniversary of two of the most forward-looking, liberal pieces of legislation ever designed to protect the health and welfare of the American people. I refer to the first Pure Food and Drugs Act—Public Law 384, 59th Congress, 1st session, Thirty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 768—and the first Meat Inspection Act—Public Law 382, Thirty-fourth United States Statutes at Large, page 674, 59th Congress, 1st session—both signed into law on June 30, 1906, by the great conservationist and humanitarian, Theodore Roosevelt.

Mr. President, we can never reiterate too much the necessity of this type of legislation, nor can we ever relax our surveillance with respect to the protection and improvement of the human resources of this Nation. The problems of health are like the duties of the housewife: they are never finished. Thus, the celebration of the 50th anniversary of this historic legislation should remind us of our continuing responsibility to review the need for improved legislation and improved enforcement procedures of our pure food and meat inspection laws.

It is fitting on this occasion, Mr. President, to recall the conditions that preceded pure food and meat inspection legislation. This type of legislation became imperative because of the willingness of producers of food, drink, and drugs to inundate the markets of the country with adulterated merchandise. Here was a shameful blight on our national conscience because immoral manufacturers put profit ahead of the welfare of the consuming public. Heinous frauds were perpetrated on the unwitting consumer who bought inferior articles labeled as goods of standard quality. Moreover, we must recall the serious menace to public health that these practices engendered; food products, particularly meat, were commonly sold which were impure, diseased, or other-

wise completely unfit for human consumption. The grossness of these abuses culminated in the enactment of the first pure food and drug and meat inspection laws.

The Congress led the way and its example provided the States with the incentive to make improvements on the Federal law within their own jurisdictions. Originally, the Congress was faced by constitutional obstacles, because no authority was given by that instrument to legislate on food and drugs or the regulation of the processes of manufacturing. Finally, the interstate commerce clause was used as the basis of this legislation. But the original laws were weak.

It was in 1938, under the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, that a Food and Drug Administration was set up under authority of Public Law 717—Fifty-second United States Statutes at Large, page 1040, 75th Congress, 3d session—which put teeth in the earlier law. Senator Copeland, of New York, a great scientist and physician in his own right, is worthy of tribute as the man who successfully sponsored and brought to fruition his dream that governmental authority might more efficaciously lead the way in the protection of the consuming public from the virus of adulterated food products.

Originally under the Department of Agriculture, the Food and Drug Administration was transferred to the Federal Security Agency in 1940. It is now part of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department which was created from the Federal Security Agency in 1953.

Thus today we find our Government with machinery to cover the Nation with chemists and inspectors, fully equipped with testing laboratories. The scope of operation under these laws includes enforcement operations, scientific investigations, control of new drugs, food standards, pesticide tolerances, and certification services.

Mr. President, in the July issue of Consumer Reports there is an excellent review of the past 50 years of the Pure Food and Drugs Act. The analysis is made by both medical and economic consultants. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FIFTY YEARS OF THE FOOD AND DRUG ACT A REVIEW BY CU'S MEDICAL CONSULTANTS

On the average, consumers spend a quarter of their incomes, a total of about \$65 billion a year, for products—foods, drugs, medical devices, and cosmetics—covered by Federal and State food and drug legislation. Basically, these laws are intended to insure that such products are clean, wholesome, and what they are claimed to be. That is, food for sale must not be filthy, decomposed, poisonous, or otherwise unfit for human consumption; drugs must not be dangerous to health and life when used as prescribed, must be up to given standards of potency and reasonably effective for the conditions they are purported to alleviate; dangerous drugs must be kept unavailable to consumers except through prescription; cosmetics and therapeutic devices must be safe to use, and

so on. In short, the food and drug laws—of which the 1906 act was the foundation—are the most important consumer-protection laws of the Nation.

The hero of this year's celebration is Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, physician, and chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture from 1883 to 1912. After leading the drive to arouse the public and Congress to the dangers of impure drugs, patent-medicine quackery, and filthy and poisoned foods, he finally saw his efforts rewarded in the passage on June 30, 1906, of the Federal Food and Drugs Act.

The food and drug law and its companion meat-inspection act, which established the inspection and grading of meats by the United States Department of Agriculture, were enacted during a period of unrestrained competitive abuses, increasing concentration of people in cities, rapid growth of food-processing industries, and rapid progress in the science of medicine. The consumer could no longer even attempt to determine for himself the purity, safety, or nutritional value of foods, for these were often grown on large farms hundreds or thousands of miles away, then processed and packaged in large food factories. Nor could he judge the safety or effectiveness of drugs and patent medicines, which were only too often marketed without proper standards of quality and purity, or concern for safety and effectiveness.

When the medicine man held sway

Uncontrolled to any significant extent by a sense of community responsibility, many food processors and drug makers made little effort to insure the safety or cleanliness of their products. Dr. Wiley and others showed that harmful amounts of boric acid, borax, salicylic acid, and formaldehyde were being used as preservatives in foods; that there was sometimes no chicken or turkey in products sold as potted chicken or potted turkey; that sales of Vermont maple sirup exceeded the production capacity of that State by about 10 times; that doctors were prescribing drugs of uncertain purity and quality; and that scores of patent medicines containing harmful amounts of alcohol, opium, and cocaine were being freely marketed as pain killers, female-trouble remedies, tonics, headache powders, and cancer cures—with claims that would make some contemporary advertisers green with envy.

Cruder abuses curbed

The 1906 law, passed over the bitter opposition of influential sections of the food and drug industries, helped to curb some of the cruder of these abuses. As the population increased, as the food industry continued to grow in size and complexity, and as the pharmaceutical and cosmetic industries began to expand in the wake of advances in medical science and chemistry, new problems in food and drug regulation arose, and serious weaknesses in the law became apparent. Especially conspicuous was the law's failure to give the enforcing agency, the Department of Agriculture, authority to set up legal standards for foods, to inspect food-processing and handling establishments, to require prior proof of the safety of new drugs before they were put on the market, or to exercise any control over cosmetics. Dangerous amounts of harmful chemicals continued to be used in preserving, processing, dyeing, and flavoring foods. Harmful amounts of arsenic and lead residues from insecticide sprays were often present on apples and other fruits when they reached the consumer. Misrepresentation of the weight, composition, and nutritional value of foods still occurred. Imitation foods were widely sold without being labeled as imitations. There was no control whatsoever over therapeutic devices, and such absurdities as whistles for developing weak lungs, nose straighteners, fake sunlamps, bust developers, eye exercisers, and "radioactive" and

magnetic devices for the cure of serious ailments were freely sold.

Horror and tragedy

Although the act forbade false claims on labels of remedies for cancer, coughs, colds, tuberculosis, epilepsy, and the like, the 1912 Sherley amendment required the Government to prove that such claims were not only false but fraudulent. The practical problem of providing evidence that would convince a court that a drug manufacturer knew his claims were false was a great handicap to the Government in its efforts to protect the consumer. And even if the Government won its case, the manufacturer could simply transfer his fraudulent claims from the package to his newspaper and magazine advertisements, over which the law had no jurisdiction.

In 1912, Dr. Wiley, "having been convinced that it was useless for me to remain any longer as a Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry which had been deprived of practically all its authority under the law," resigned. In his letter of resignation he said among other things, "I saw the fundamental principles of the 1906 Food and Drugs Act * * * one by one paralyzed or discredited."

The dedication of the Food and Drug Administration officials (now transferred from the Bureau of Chemistry and established as a separate unit of the Department of Agriculture) could not make up for the serious gaps in the law, but with its 1933 "Chamber of Horrors" exhibit, the FDA did succeed in arousing people to the law's deficiencies and the advantage taken of them by food and drug manufacturers. Such books as "100,000,000 Guinea Pigs," published in the thirties, helped to increase public awareness of the need for drastic revision of the law.

In 1937, an event occurred that had a deep effect on public opinion: 105 persons died from poisoning by an "Elixir of Sulfanilamide." After adding diethylene glycol, an antifreeze agent, to the elixir as a solvent, the manufacturer had marketed the product without testing its toxicity. This event helped to end 5 years of debate, characterized by bitter opposition to any change in the law from many drug manufacturers and food processors and by indifference or even hostility to the idea on the part of many newspapers. On June 25, 1938, a new food and drug law came into being—the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetics Act.

The new law

The new law covered cosmetics and therapeutic devices as well as foods and drugs and, in general, was intended to strengthen the Government's hand in its efforts to insure for the American people wholesome, healthful, clean, and truthfully labeled food, and safe and effective drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices. It was designed also to protect legitimate producers from unfair competition by the unscrupulous. Despite some serious weaknesses, it was a definite advance over the 1906 law. The task of enforcing it and four related acts was given to the FDA, now removed from the Agriculture Department and under the aegis of the Federal Security Administration.

Under the seizure provisions of the new law, any food, drug, therapeutic device, or cosmetic that was impure, dangerous, or misbranded could be seized and condemned. Furthermore, the law gave the FDA authority to establish reasonable definitions and standards of identity for foods, to make factory inspections, and to prohibit the marketing of foods produced under insanitary conditions. Containers which might make foods injurious to health, and the use in foods of coal-tar colors, unless officially certified to be harmless, were banned. However, the law does not require manufacturers or processors to supply prior proof of the safety of a chemical before using it in foods.

A food product is deemed misbranded if offered for sale under the name of another food unless it is plainly marked as an imitation of that food. The label of a product sold as a food for which no definition and standard of identity have been established must state the common names of all the ingredients in it in order of their prevalence. Neither the amount nor the proportions of the ingredients are required to be listed, but artificial flavorings and, for dietary aids, information on vitamin and mineral content must be noted. The label must also disclose the use of artificial coloring, except for that in butter, cheese, and ice cream. The Miller amendment, passed in 1954, authorized FDA to establish safe tolerances in the final product for poisonous materials (pesticides, for example) used in the growing of fruit and vegetable crops.

To prevent another tragedy of the elixir of sulfanilamide type, the law requires a company marketing a new drug to file an application giving full reports of investigations showing that the drug was safe for use; a full statement of the composition of the drug; a full description of methods used to make, process, and pack the drug and specimens of proposed labeling of the drug. The FDA studies the data, and, if convinced that the new preparation is safe it makes effective the application.

Loopholes to be plugged

One cannot overlook the fact, however, that the new drug provision has several major weaknesses. The provision as to the safety of a new drug is based largely or entirely on the drug company's experimental and clinical data filed with the application. Consciously or unconsciously, experimental research and clinical tests undertaken by a pharmaceutical company would tend to show the most favorable aspects of the drug's effects and tend to hide serious toxic or other side effects.

A drug or cosmetic is deemed adulterated if it was produced under insanitary conditions, contains insanitary ingredients, is packed in a poisonous container, or is colored with an uncertified coal-tar coloring. Established drugs are required to conform to the standards of purity and quality set forth in the United States Pharmacopoeia and the National Formulary.

If its labeling is "false or misleading in any particular," a cosmetic is considered misbranded. Hair dyes may contain uncertified coal-tar colors only if the label or instructions give adequate directions for preliminary testing and a warning against use on eyelashes or eyebrows, since such use "may cause blindness."

Congress also gave the FDA the task of regulating all intrastate sale of food and drugs shipped across State lines; the sale of colored oleomargarine in hotels and restaurants; drug-store sales of prescription drugs; domestic production of insulin, coal-tar colors, and five antibiotic drugs; and inspecting seafood establishments.

Under the Wheeler-Lea amendment, control over the advertising of foods, drugs, cosmetics, and treatment devices was turned over to the Federal Trade Commission.

To give consumers adequate protection against the many serious hazards which now exist, not only is a much larger appropriation needed for the enforcement of the present food, drug, and cosmetic law, but there is also need for changes in the law and for greater protection of consumers in areas now covered by other agencies and other laws. False, misleading, and exaggerated advertising claims, for example, are outside the scope of FDA's control and are inadequately curbed. Controls on the use of chemicals of unknown hazard in cosmetics and in many foods are grossly inadequate. There is a serious hazard in the lack of compulsory sanitary inspection of poultry processing plants of a kind now required in meat pack-

ing plants. Foods and drugs produced and sold within a State come under often inadequate State laws, not the Federal act. Labels of such commonly used poisonous products as dry cleaning fluids, paint, paint remover, shoe polish, and metal polish must carry neither a warning nor a listing of ingredients.

From this brief survey of the provisions of the 1938 law, related acts, and subsequent amendments and regulations, it might appear that the consumer at last is adequately protected on the food and drug front, but unfortunately this is far from true. While these measures were an important advance in consumer protection, they are marred by serious flaws—and the health and welfare of the American people have suffered as a result. To aggravate the evil, Congress has never provided the FDA with enough money to enforce the laws. Appropriations of \$4-\$5 million a year for an agency that required \$20 million a year to do its job resulted in serious gaps in the protection of consumers (see p. 363). A citizens committee appointed last year to study the FDA confirmed that there were serious deficiencies in the agency's activities and recommended a 3- to 4-fold increase in funds over a 5- to 10-year period.

We do not hear today of elixir of sulfanilamide tragedies. The laws' weaknesses and failures in enforcement are reflected in more subtle impairment of health and danger to life. The cumulative and chronic effects of life-long consumption of foods processed with chemicals of unknown or potential toxic or carcinogenic properties may be difficult to spot but that they constitute a public health problem is affirmed by responsible health organizations such as the American Public Health Association and the American Medical Association.

Consumers beware

A short survey of highlights in the most recent annual report of the FDA (now a part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare), for the fiscal year ended June 1955, will give some indication of the Administration's varied activities, the magnitude and complexity of the problems confronting it, and the pressing need for more effective enforcement of our food and drug legislation, and for remedying some of its weaknesses.

"Gross adulteration [of food], such as visible filth or decay, has been left largely for detection by the consumer," says the report, though in the year ending June 30, 1955, the FDA seized 2,544 tons of filthy or decomposed food. Some 300,000 pounds of food tainted with poisonous or harmful materials were also seized. Among these were coffee beans contaminated with lead ore during shipment; soft drinks containing a harmful chemical as a preservative; canned black-eyed peas containing glass; oats that had been treated with a mercury compound for seed use and later entered food channels.

Large and well-known companies as well as small, little-known ones were among the offenders. "One of the oldest and largest manufacturers of chocolate products and candy . . . was found to be operating a seriously infested factory, with resultant contamination of raw materials, equipment, scrap for candy reuse, and finished products awaiting packing," says the report. "Seizures were made of finished chocolate and confectionery products heavily contaminated with rodent and insect filth. Prosecution action is under consideration."

Needed: Money and men

The FDA did not have either the staff or the resources to investigate many suspected swindles, but it uncovered some while looking into sanitary and health violations. "Among the deliberate cheats were coffee adulterated with spent grounds, chaff, and chickpeas; . . . turkeys, oysters, and clams [whose weight had been increased by in-

jection of water]; sorghum with added glucose; egg yolk stretched with nonfat dry milk solids; and fish misbranded with names of more expensive varieties."

Of 32 drugs recalled from distribution during the year, 15 were voluntarily called back by the manufacturers at the FDA's request. Twelve recalled drugs were antibiotics which had not been certified by the FDA or were substandard or mislabeled. Four were new drugs marketed before their safety had been established. Other cases involved nonsterile injection drugs, low potency, decomposition, failure of tablets to disintegrate, a labeling mixup, and contamination with glass particles.

Another FDA activity was tracking down and stopping illegal sales of such drugs as the barbiturates and amphetamines. Amphetamine (benzedrine and dexedrine) pep pills are often used by criminals to bolster their nerve, and they have contributed to highway accidents by stimulating drivers to keep going despite fatigue.

Many drugs were seized for failure to conform to the label statement of composition, for contamination, or for extravagant label claims. In one group of actions, a firm was fined \$2,000 for claiming that its ultraviolet ray device would relieve all pain and congestion, stimulate the circulation, restore vigor and youth, insure a clear complexion, prevent baldness, and cure numerous other disorders. There were seizures of alfalfa-seed mixtures recommended by the manufacturers for treatment of arthritis, rheumatism, and related troubles. The year also saw the beginning of effective action against Harry M. Hoxsey and the Hoxsey Clinic treatment for cancer. This case reached its climax last April when the FDA issued a public warning that the Hoxsey method not only was worthless as a treatment for cancer, but could sometimes aggravate the condition.

These are some of the accomplishments of the FDA in the face of serious weaknesses of the law and inadequate funds for enforcing the law. How many violations go undetected (particularly in pesticide residues on fruits and vegetables) and how much sickness is the consequence of gaps in protection can only be conjectured.

Balance sheet

Although the FDA has done a good job, within its limitations, it has become more and more apparent in recent years that even the best efforts of a group of dedicated public servants cannot properly protect the public when our food and drug laws are so full of loopholes and when resources for enforcement, education, and research are so inadequate. The consumer has tremendous stakes in adequate food and drug legislation and its effective enforcement. But control will not be adequate so long as consumers remain ignorant of the provisions and shortcomings of the laws, and so long as they assume that an enlightened Government and enlightened industries automatically guarantee them safe and effective foods, drugs, cosmetics, and therapeutic devices.

A REVIEW BY CU'S ECONOMICS CONSULTANTS

Although the products under the control of the Federal Food and Drug Administration are used every day in every home, and their purity and safety are of vital concern to everyone, the general public does not realize that in many areas, food and drug controls have become progressively less effective. Among experts in these areas, however, uneasiness about the deterioration of control has grown over the years into a sense of impending danger. Yet, without public awareness of the seriousness of the situation, there has not been enough pressure on Congress to appropriate the funds required to protect our national health and safety.

That the lack of funds is the key factor in the present hazardous situation is not dis-

puted anywhere. Compare the \$5,500,000 FDA 1955 appropriation with the one of \$14 million-plus voted to administer the Federal Meat Inspection Act or the one of \$18 million to eradicate farm pests and plant and animal diseases. Canada, with a population of only a little over 15 million, today spends almost \$1,500,000 to administer its food and drug acts—nearly 10 cents per person for this purpose, as compared with our 3½ cents.

As a result of the cripplingly inadequate financial support given the FDA, the agency has had to reduce its personnel by 15 percent since 1951. Laboratory and other equipment has not been kept abreast of modern technological development. Field travel by FDA inspectors and other personnel has been curtailed. A planned program of educational cooperation with industry has not been developed. Consumers have not been informed of violations. While violations of the law continue, a backlog of legal actions has accumulated.

The citizens committee report

In January 1955 the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, of which the FDA is a subsidiary agency, appointed a Citizens Advisory Committee to investigate, report, and make recommendations about the amount and kind of enforcement of food and drug laws needed to serve the best interest of the country.

The report, which came out just a year ago, stated flatly that "the scope and complexity of the present enforcement and regulatory problems, if dealt with inadequately, constitute a threat to the health and welfare of our citizens." Then it went on to make the blunt statement that "the resources of the FDA are woefully inadequate to discharge its present responsibilities."

Those were strong words for such a committee, 14 persons prominent in business, science, education, and such organizations as trade unions and women's clubs—people as unlikely as any you could find to exaggerate or want to alarm the public unduly. Although its statement that the health and safety of every family in the Nation were threatened could hardly be considered less than dramatic news, this did not receive anything like the press coverage it merited.

Modest advances

Still, the report has borne some fruit. This year, Congress was asked to raise FDA's enforcement appropriation by a little over a million dollars, an increase of approximately 17 percent, bringing the total appropriation for the 1956-57 fiscal year to \$6,779,000. The House of Representatives already has voted the increase, and, at this writing, all indications are that the Senate will too.

The increase is modest enough. Even with it, the appropriation will amount to less than a tiny fraction of 1 percent of the total retail cost of the goods to be controlled. The Citizens Advisory Committee recommended an annual increase during the next 5 to 10 years that finally would give the FDA an operating budget 3 to 4 times the size of its present one.

There are many reasons why an increase in funds for the FDA has become so necessary and why an eventual appropriation less than that advised by the Citizens Committee will fall far short of the job. The world has been changing, and these changes have compounded the difficulties of the FDA's job. In the first place, as everybody knows, the population has grown. But that is less than half the story. More important is the fact that the urban population has made up a far larger part of the total than it used to. People have been moving off the farms and out of small towns into cities. That means that more and more families have become dependent on what our grandmothers called

store-bought foods—manufactured and processed foods that are hauled long distances before being put on sale to consumers. Manufacturing and processing, hauling and warehousing, loading and unloading—all mean handling. And increased handling always means increased opportunities for spoilage, infestation, decomposition, and contamination.

Deteriorating standards

With a greater quantity of food to handle and longer distances to haul it, food processors have, of course, been eager for ways to protect products from spoilage and infestation. Out of this desire has arisen another serious hazard. Since World War II, the American chemical industry has grown into an industrial giant, with all manner of products to sell to food processors to ease the problems that changing technology and rapid urbanization have created for them. Thus, there are on the market chemicals to color, stabilize, preserve, and flavor foods. There are other chemicals to kill such pests as the rats and flies that plague warehouses and packing plants, and to reduce the insect and fungus infestation of grains, fruits, and vegetables on the farm. In this bonanza of chemical products there are many whose safety for human ingestion in the amounts presently used is highly questionable.

Like most other American industries during these boom years, the chemical industry has quickened its pace and gone in for the "hard sell," constantly putting new products on the market and promoting them with all the pressure possible. Moreover, this fevered drive comes after years at war—first World War II, then Korea. Nearly all commercial standards tend to decline under wartime conditions—standards of quality, sanitation, safety, and ethics. Hence, one of the legacies of any extended wartime period is a deterioration in the commercial world's capacity for self-discipline.

The processor who attempts to keep or raise his standards has a hard time of it under such circumstances. An indication of how difficult it is to keep a food product fit for human consumption was given recently in a trade magazine, *Dairy Food Review*. The magazine published a speech by Mr. H. F. DePew, an executive of the National Dairy Co., on the subject *Quality of Non-Dairy Ingredients in Ice Cream*. Mr. DePew recounted some recent experiences of his company in buying materials to be used in its ice cream. Of liquid sugar he said, "Only 4 out of 27 samples were given an unqualified O. K." Of fruit: "I saw a report recently from a plant complaining that shipments of strawberries from one packer contained rope fragments, nails, insect parts, chewing gum, wire, leaves, and stems." Nuts: "Shells found in nut ice creams . . . rancidity . . . a fairly large shipment of walnuts which became webby during storage." Chocolate: "Sanitation in some of the chocolate supply houses is still in a rather primitive state." Dry milk powder: "Infested with insects." Cones and cookies: "I could tell you instances of beetles found in them." Candy for use as an ice cream ingredient: "I am sure you have all encountered candy which has turned slightly rancid." Cartons: "I could also tell you of instances where insects were found in a shipment of containers." Chemicals: "I could tell you about stabilizers and emulsifiers masking flavor or producing off-flavors in ice cream."

Keep in mind that the foregoing is not from a report of an FDA seizure; it is from a speech by one ice-cream maker to other ice-cream makers. Remember, too, that dairy food are subject to more control than any other kind of food. State, county, and city public-health officials, as well as State agricultural departments, join the FDA in attempting to keep dairy products pure and healthful.

What Mr. DePew recommended that ice-cream manufacturers do to correct the unpleasant and dangerous situation he had found was precisely the kind of thing the FDA is empowered to do for foods and drugs in general, but has been unable to do properly because it hasn't had the money. He wound up his talk this way:

"What can we do? . . . We can visit the plants supplying our nondairy ingredients. . . . We can set up specific raw-material standards for liquid sugar, corn syrup, strawberries, and other such materials. We can institute inspection reports. . . . We can require bacteria, yeast, and mold counts on all raw materials received. . . . I believe it is desirable from an industry standpoint that a concerted and united effort be made by the ice-cream manufacturers in this direction."

Herculean task

The visiting of plants recommended by Mr. DePew is similar to the FDA's inspection program. The need for far greater inspection service was repeatedly stressed in the citizens-committee report. Anyone familiar with the problems of the kind of control that FDA is supposed to exercise will tell you that there is no escaping the need for regular and repeated plant inspections. Yet today, the FDA can afford no more than 250 inspectors—and the agency is responsible for checking on every plant, distributor, and retailer making or handling foods, drugs, or cosmetics involved in interstate commerce. The citizens committee estimated that almost 100,000 establishments were under FDA control. In the year ending June 1955, FDA inspectors visited about 11,000 establishments, and at that rate, assuming the 100,000 estimate is accurate, it would take them about 9 years to complete their inspection rounds.

The number of plants under the FDA's supervision changes from day to day. Daily, small firms start, buy products processed in larger plants, package and label them under different brand names, and send them out to market. In the drug field, especially, these small branders can be a serious hazard unless subject to control, because a drug label, containing directions for use and warnings of danger, is so important. In the case of foods, this type of branding operation adds to handling and storage, hence increases the opportunities for spoilage or contamination.

Now that dietetic foods have become important mass-produced products, misbranding of food can sometimes be as much of a health hazard as misbranding of drugs. Take canned food which is sold for certain heart and kidney conditions as sodium-free. Food-and-drug inspectors have found such products that contained sizable amounts of sodium. Obviously, the health of the patient depending on one of these would be endangered.

Doctors, drugs, and detail men

Perhaps the biggest changes, and also the biggest problems for FDA, have occurred in the area of marketing practices and as a result of the volume and rapidity of introduction of new products. An additional legacy of a period of wartime seems to be a speeded-up technology. Hence, the years right after a war find industry after industry experiencing rapid change. Nearly every industry can claim a revolution of sorts since World War II. One of the most dramatic of these has been that in the so-called ethical-drugs (drugs available to consumers only by prescription) industry. During the past 15 years, this industry has undergone one of the profoundest shifts in trade practices in its history. A very large percentage of the drugs now used in filling prescriptions were unknown before World War II. In marketing this spate of new drugs, the industry has turned to tactics which were all but unknown to it before the war—practices which

have contributed enormously to the difficulty of controlling the distribution of dangerous drugs.

Manufacturers of what were called "ethical" drugs to distinguish them from patent medicines have adopted the tactics of the oldtime patent medicine seller—but with this difference: their heavy sales pressure, exaggerated claims, and gigantic advertising outlays are aimed at doctors, not consumers. Thus, the medical profession now appears to be viewed as a kind of sales transmission belt for drug manufacturers. Through their prescriptions and recommendations to patients, doctors are looked to to create a market for the rapidly increasing output of drugs advertised and branded by ethical drug manufacturers. The pressure to turn doctors into peddlers of branded drugs has swelled to an avalanche since World War II.

According to industry spokesmen, there are more than 15,000 drug salesmen now calling on doctors, leaving samples, urging that new drugs be tried out on patients or that an old drug not be forgotten. There is no way to check on what claims are made for what drugs by these "detail" men.

Sick chickens

On the food side, one of the most pressing problems at present is the poultry industry. This problem, too, has been compounded by marketing changes. Years ago, poultry raising was hardly an industry at all. Flocks were small. Generally a by-product of grain farming, they were often the sole responsibility of the farmer's wife. Hence, consumers for the most part obtained their poultry from farms near at hand. Today, however, more than half the poultry sold is produced in what the industry calls commercial flocks. The birds are slaughtered and dressed in large plants using semi-automatic machinery and continuous-flow production patterns. The combination of large flocks and modern processing methods has greatly increased the hazard to public health from the sale of diseased poultry.

A good many students of the subject believe that poultry is subject to more diseases that can be transmitted to man than any of the mammals we eat. Some of these diseases—paratyphoid and psittacosis, for example—can be fatal to humans. When poultry was grown in small numbers on widely scattered farms, diseased flocks tended to die out quickly, and the farmer's wife simply started over again with a new set of hatching eggs. However, now that flocks are large, and the sole crop of their grower, and are frequently financed by feed dealers or others, sick or dead birds mean something more serious than putting off the buying of a new bonnet. They mean the loss of a sizable investment. Hence, pressure to salvage at least some of the crop is hard to resist. Furthermore, poultry herded into huge flocks, often running up into the thousands and tens of thousands, obviously is more in danger of infection than the small farm flocks were. As a matter of fact, some agricultural specialists say that our poultry flocks today are so seriously infected that a national program for poultry—somewhat like that undertaken years ago to handle the tuberculosis infection of our cattle herds—is needed.

With modern poultry-processing methods, any infection becomes a multiplied threat, because a single diseased bird can infect a whole day's plant run, even more if the plant's sanitation methods are lax. The only reliable protection is continuous inspection of birds before they hit the processing line, where they can spread infection. Less than 20 percent of the poultry on sale today, however, is inspected, and even that 20 percent is not subject to adequate inspection.

Details of what now goes on in the poultry business—the dosing with new medicines and medicated feeds, the trade stories about the use of chemicals and processing methods to mask evidence of infection, the marketing

of sick and disease-killed birds, and the record of humans infected by diseased poultry—make a tale to rival the lurid accounts of meatpacking plants in Upton Sinclair's *The Jungle*, a book which has been credited with arousing the Nation to the passage of the Meat Inspection Act back in 1907. At the moment there are several bills in Congress that would require stricter regulation of poultry, but no action on them is expected at this session.

The job ahead

There are many other 1956 FDA problems that are in some respects more explosive than those of a half-century ago and that will require more and more care and caution on the part of both industry and Government. For example, the frozen-food industry, with an excellent record to date, has launched a rapidly expanding program of production of precooked frozen foods (dinners, meat and chicken pies, etc.) that poses potential new dangers. Also, we import far greater quantities of both food and drugs than we used to, and the FDA, even if its new appropriation is approved, will not have enough manpower to inspect these adequately. Medical quackery appears to be growing, and the use of both stimulating drugs to pep us up, tranquilizers to soothe us, and hypnotics to make us sleep is rising at an alarming rate in spite of FDA's efforts to control their sale. And so on and on—until the list includes almost as many new problems as there are kinds of products sold to consumers.

The citizens committee apparently has succeeded in needling Congress into giving the FDA the means to start an attack on the great backlog of undone tasks piled up during the war and postwar years. But it will be up to the consumers of the Nation to see to it that this start is the beginning of a full-scale, long-range program, not just a flash in the pan.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. In conclusion, Mr. President, may I say that the 50th anniversary of this protective, humanitarian legislation should recall to us the pioneers in the Congress and the Nation who made it all possible. It should recall, also, the advantages that have accrued to those manufacturers and producers who have come to realize the commercial advantages of purity and cleanliness and have in numerous cases been happy to advertise the fact that they have gone far beyond the requirements of the minimum requirements of the law.

ECHOES OF THE LADEJINSKY CASE

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, many Senators will have seen the article which appeared in the *New York Times* on June 17, 1956, concerning the new furor over J. Glen Cassity, the Department of Agriculture official who previously achieved some notoriety in the famous Ladejinsky case. Mr. Cassity has sent out questionnaires bearing on employee loyalty and he received a rather pointed reply from Mr. John C. Baker, chief of the Midwest Information Service of the Department's Agricultural and Marketing Service.

In discussing his possible guilt by association, Mr. Baker reported to Mr. Cassity that—

Then there was another guy who sometimes invited his brother to ride in our car pool during the early months of the war; it crowded us, but we didn't object because he was an Army man and knew so many tricks of espionage. The one guy left Wash-

ington and now is connected with some college in Pennsylvania. I wonder what ever became of Milton's brother Ike.

Mr. President, it has also come to my attention that this same John Baker has recently been congratulated by Secretary Benson for his good public-relations work. Among the items for which he has been sent special commendation are his suggestion that President Eisenhower cut the cake celebrating the anniversary of the school-lunch program and for his special public-relations suggestions that were used in connection with one of Secretary Benson's recent appearances in Milwaukee.

It is no wonder, then, that Secretary Benson is reported in yesterday morning's—June 28, 1956—*Washington Post* and *Times Herald* to have told his news conference yesterday that his Security Chief, Mr. Cassity, is only "good, generally speaking." But the Secretary's press conference again displayed the lack of coordination within the Department to which we now have become accustomed. Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse had previously announced that Mr. Baker's answers to Mr. Cassity's questionnaire were "satisfactory" and that the case "has been closed." But Secretary Benson told the newsmen yesterday that he did not know who "closed the case" and that it had never been presented to him.

I have expressed the hope on prior occasions, Mr. President, that the responsible officials and the Secretary of Agriculture study their own operations carefully enough so that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing. I express this hope again today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from the *New York Times* and also one from the *Washington Post* and *Times Herald* be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

[From the *New York Times* of June 17, 1956]

LADEJINSKY ACCUSER LAUNCHES NEW CASE (By William M. Blair)

WASHINGTON, June 16.—The Department of Agriculture security officer who precipitated the dismissal of Wolf Ladejinsky in 1954 has opened a new case that, officials fear, may cause further commotion within the administration.

The officer, J. Glen Cassity, has drawn the fire of a Department employee to whom he sent questionnaires bearing on the employee's loyalty. The employee, a friend of many past and present high officials of the Department, has denounced Mr. Cassity's methods in a satirical letter that has been circulating privately among a large audience in Washington.

The employee is John C. Baker, Chief of the Midwest Information Service of the Department's Agricultural and Marketing Service. Mr. Baker, a 47-year-old World War II veteran, joined the Department in 1938. He once shared in a Washington car pool with Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, president of Pennsylvania State University and brother of President Eisenhower, a fact which is brought into the letter. Dr. Eisenhower then was with the Department.

It was understood that Ezra T. Benson, Secretary of Agriculture, who backed the security officer in the Ladejinsky case, was unaware of the matter. But the new case has come to the attention of the Depart-

ment's Loyalty Review Committee that was set up to resolve conflicts in security cases after the Ladejinsky affair caused President Eisenhower to direct an overhaul of the administration's security review procedure.

LADEJINSKY ACCUSED

Mr. Ladejinsky, an expert on land reform, was the American agricultural attaché in Tokyo in 1954 when Mr. Cassity brought security charges against him. Secretary Benson dismissed Mr. Ladejinsky, but later apologized and expunged the security risk charge from Mr. Ladejinsky's record.

In his 2½ page "Dear Glen" letter to Mr. Cassity, whom he has never met, Mr. Baker said in part:

"You're a regular ol' hound dog when you hit the trail of an enemy of democracy, aren't you? And here I've been thinking all along that I was fooling everybody. But not Cassity. Nosirree. Well, since I've been found out, I might as well tell all.

"When I lived in Washington I did most of my traveling in a car pool. You simply have no idea how the national security is plotted against in a car pool. One of the fellows I used to conspire with is still continuing the good work in Agriculture: Director of Information. Another moved from the USDA underground into the open; he's information director for the Atomic Energy Commission, in charge of leaking secrets to the enemy.

"Then there was another guy who sometimes invited his brother to ride in our car pool during the early months of the war; it crowded us, but we didn't object because he was an Army man and knew so many tricks of espionage. The one guy left Washington and now is connected with some college in Pennsylvania. I wonder whatever became of Milton's brother, Ike.

"Civilian life is all right for an agent provocateur, but the real place to ply your trade is in the military during a war. You see, I was getting toward the upper age limit, had a couple of kids and a draft-exempt job in a war agency; but I found my enemy contacts weren't as close as they might be. So wormed my way into the Marine Corps. That was livin'. And did I fool those generals. They made me custodian of operations plans and other top-secret documents at a Marine headquarters in the Pacific. What a spot for a skilled operator."

QUESTION DEALT WITH

Mr. Baker's letter then dealt with the first question in an interrogatory Mr. Cassity sent him. The question concerned a report that Mr. Baker, in connection with clearance for a sensitive Government position in 1948, had deplored the fact that the Government was conducting a "witch hunt."

Mr. Baker's sworn answer of May 26 stated that he was employed outside the Federal Government from July 1946 to January 1950; therefore I have no recollection of having made such a statement in connection with any investigation.

Mr. Baker's letter said:

"Seems strange I don't remember two words 'witch hunt' that I'm supposed to have used in 1948. But you don't give me any hint as to where, when, to whom, or about what. Gotta sharpen up, boy. National security, you know.

"Honestly, Glen, don't you feel kinda foolish standing there in broad daylight, holding two little words? Trying to fashion them into a noose?"

In his letter, Mr. Baker said that if some parts of his letter "seem frivolous, let me explain it's a device—a device I'm using to try to keep from getting awfully mad.

"But has anybody questioned your loyalty?" He went on, "Ever asked you to tell what you meant by something you may or may not have said 8 years earlier—as a means of determining whether or not your employment is clearly consistent with the interests of national security? It's an experience that

you, more than anybody I know of, really ought to go through."

In answering the "interrogatory," Mr. Baker gave a "no" to 10 questions regarding membership in subversive organizations.

In a letter accompanying the "interrogatory," Mr. Cassidy wrote Mr. Baker that "your answer to the questions in the interrogatory will be considered and a determination made in your case under the Government employment security program."

Since the first "interrogatory" Mr. Baker has received another questionnaire about a speech he made in 1942 or 1943.

In Chicago, Mr. Baker said he had "no comment" on his communications with Mr. Cassidy.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of June 28, 1956]

BENSON DENIES OUSTING AIDE

Agriculture Secretary Ezra T. Benson said yesterday he merely suggested to R. B. McLeish that he consider resigning as head of the Farmers' Home Administration after congressional testimony that he drank on the job.

But Benson said he did not force McLeish out. He told a news conference McLeish made the decision.

McLeish, who resigned last week, said he got the idea from Benson.

Benson also defended the actions of his security chief, J. Glen Cassidy, as good, generally speaking. He added, "I have given no thought to replacing him."

Benson referred specifically to Cassidy's handling of the security questioning of John C. Baker, information chief of the Department's marketing service in Chicago.

Baker's case came up when he wrote a sharp letter to Cassidy indicating that the security chief had questioned Baker's loyalty. Baker is a longtime Government employee and a Marine Corps veteran of World War II. Under Secretary of Agriculture True D. Morse, said later that Baker's answers to Cassidy's questions were satisfactory and that the case has been closed.

Benson said he did not know who closed the case and that it had never been presented to him.

Benson also discussed these subjects:

Soil bank—it is making very good progress. About 12,000 to 15,000 farmers in Iowa alone had signed up by Monday. Reports show many also were signing up in Kansas, Texas, and Illinois.

Agricultural Advisory Commission.—He said the Commission reported crops are looking reasonably good; that farmers liked the veto of the first farm bill calling for a return to high price supports; and approved the relaxed soil-bank restrictions on grazing.

GEN. LAURIS NORSTAD

Mr. HUMPHREY of Minnesota. Mr. President, when General Gruenther's resignation as NATO's Supreme Commander was announced last April Minnesotans had a particular interest in his successor. Gen. Lauris Norstad is a native Minnesotan who has been variously described by his associates as "the boy wonder of the military services," "a precision instrument," and "a philosopher in uniform." General Gruenther himself has said of General Norstad that he "has one of the keenest strategic minds in the world today." Those of us who are concerned about the future of NATO are particularly reassured to have General Norstad in command.

Mr. President, in the New York Times for June 27, 1956, Mr. C. L. Sulzberger,

writing from France, devoted a full-length column to General Norstad. It is an excellent description of the man and his outlook on his new responsibility. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sulzberger's column be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN AFFAIRS—THE GENERALS: V—WEAPONS AND WILL POWER

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

ROCQUENCOURT, FRANCE, June 26.—The next commander of NATO's armed forces, General Norstad, never planned a military career. Like his predecessor, Gruenther, he thought seriously of civilian life. Gruenther almost resigned his commission to enter Harvard Business School. Norstad wanted to be a lawyer.

His father, a clergyman in the town of Red Wing, Minn., made a hobby of the law, taking correspondence courses. The General grew up in a legal atmosphere and spent his spare time around the county court. Even after entering West Point he planned to study for the bar following minimum Army service. However, after preparing for the cavalry, he was persuaded by his roommates to take flight training and became a pilot.

NORSTAD AT LEISURE

Out of SHAPE headquarters and in mufti Norstad looks and behaves like a cultivated middle western attorney. Among books he has recently read are Carl Sandburg's biography of Lincoln and Dean Acheson's *A Democrat Looks at His Party*. When he is not tinkering with the high-fidelity player which he wired himself, or oiling fishing rods and sorting out files, his favored way of spending an evening is to put up his feet and read or listen to records—Beethoven, Tchaikovsky, or early New Orleans and Chicago jazz. Unlike Gruenther he doesn't play bridge and considers cards a waste of time.

This is the quiet background of innumerable American civilians. Norstad regards the purpose of NATO as the defense of such a quiet life for the peoples of the Western World. And, both in conception and organization, he considers the alliance a novel organization.

THE GUIDING PRINCIPLE

"There is," he says, "no precedent for a coalition of this size and scope. It has one unique characteristic: it is based upon the principle of moral equality among all members. According to this principle the smallest ally has as much voice as the biggest. It is a great tribute to the United States that this is true. As long as we can maintain moral equality among all members we have a real future."

Norstad recognizes that the durability of any democratic alliance depends upon the desires of civilian populations as expressed through their governments. NATO's strength derives only from this, he says. "The members of the coalition must have a firm political policy from which to derive military policy. Any alert or protective action must be based on this. The Allied Governments must decide what is to be the lowest common denominator for determining military reactions. For example, if there is a hostile maneuver on the frontier of one of our members, like Turkey, what would the NATO Council's reaction be?"

COMMUNALITY OF EFFORT

Norstad is acutely aware that NATO's efficacy rests ultimately upon the willingness of western populations to pay for their police force. The sum total of protection is based upon a communality of effort. Therefore, the general warns: "Any action by one coun-

try toward cutting down or eliminating anything from its defensive contribution has an immediate reaction on other alliance members. This is directly proportional to the size of the ally taking such action. Thus, if the United States reduces its effort or ceases to provide defenses at the same level, there would be a bad effect everywhere."

Obviously the degree of resolution tends to vary among nations. Europe is no longer so frightened about imminent possibility of war as it was 5 years ago. The political background from which allied military planning derives is anything but static. Thus, as Norstad prepares to take over NATO's command, he is faced with a shifting situation. It is no longer certain he can rely for long upon bases in Iceland or Morocco. France has denuded its NATO divisions of infantry in order to fight in Algeria. Promised West German divisions have yet to materialize.

THE DANGER POINT

These factors, Norstad admits, are directly reflected in strategy. He adds: "As policies change, the military concept changes. That in turn means the type of forces alters. Nevertheless, as technical developments come about and new improvements are invented, the alliance is permitted to accomplish planning aims with fewer forces. Of course this affects what you do and how you do it. But it does not shift your purpose—the protection of all the territory and peoples in the Western alliance."

Obviously, however, a point could be reached when the military protection afforded by NATO would lose its real meaning. This would arrive if and when the democratic populations lost interest in their own defense. No material weapon can be imagined that can preserve a way of life unwilling to preserve itself. This truism is likely to present Norstad with his greatest single problem as Supreme Allied Commander. He is the first to recognize that military barriers, above all in democracies, depend upon civilian resolve. No armament can substitute for willpower.

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. CLAUDE H. CHORPENING, CORPS OF ENGINEERS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, today marks the retirement from the Army of a great South Dakotan. I refer to Maj. Gen. Claude H. Chorpene, of Trent, S. Dak., who retired today after 40 years of service in the Army engineers. A 13-gun salute was fired for General Chorpene at Fort Belvoir, Va.

The Daily Argus, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., carries an interesting résumé of General Chorpene's military service and military record. I am particularly impressed by one statement he made at the time of his retirement. He had gone to West Point as an appointee from a small town in South Dakota and worked his way up to the point where he has retired as one of the highest ranking generals South Dakota has ever provided for the military service.

General Chorpene said:

I think my own case is positive proof that the Army is completely democratic and that if a man works hard he can advance to high rank.

Mr. President, I believe that should provide encouragement to hundreds of thousands of young men in the service who may be looking forward to a military career.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire article printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRENT MAN TO END LONG ARMY SERVICE

WASHINGTON, June 26.—A 13-gun salute will be fired at Fort Belvoir, Va., Friday, in honor of Maj. Gen. Claude H. Chorpene, of Trent, S. Dak., retiring after 40 years in the Army engineers. He is 58.

One of the highest ranking officers ever to come out of South Dakota, Chorpene has served throughout the world, in war and in peace. He held high command posts in World War II in the European theater and later in the Pacific. And in 1951-54 he was the second ranking officer in the corps, in charge of the engineers' civil works projects, including the building of the big Missouri River dams.

"At retirement time," he said in an interview, "one is both glad and sad. After spending 40 years in service, one can't leave without a little tearing of the heartstrings. However, the prospect of a new career, a civilian career, is interesting, too."

Chorpene, with his wife and 7-year-old daughter, Mary Ann, plans to visit his sister, Mrs. J. C. Sorenson, at Trent, in mid-July. They will go on to Mrs. Chorpene's home at Choteau, Mont.

"I want a good rest, an opportunity to get my batteries recharged," he said. "Then we'll probably return to the Washington area."

His plans are not definite yet but he expects to enter civilian work in the engineering field.

Chorpene says he believes he was "the greenest boy" ever to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point. He had never seen a regular Army soldier and had had only 10½ years of schooling. He was graduated from West Point in 1918.

"I think my own case is positive proof that the Army is completely democratic and that if a man works hard he can advance to high rank," he commented.

In the middle 1930's, Chorpene was assistant to the district engineer constructing Fort Peck Dam in Montana. Early in World War II he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Engineers here. In 1943, he went to the European theater where he filled numerous posts before being transferred 2 years later to the Pacific. He was assistant chief of staff for operations at Camp Zama, Japan.

In 1949 he became Assistant Chief of Engineers for Personnel and Administration here and in 1951 was selected to head the civil-works program.

This brought him in close relationship with Congress as he testified before committees on projects planned or being built by the engineers.

"I enjoyed my dealings with Members of Congress and made many good friends," he said. "Basically, Congressmen want the facts. Just tell them the whole truth and if you're in left field tell them so and you'll get along fine."

Chorpene was born in Waterloo, Iowa, but when he was 3 years old, his parents were among a group which rode a special train into South Dakota in 1900. The family settled on a farm near Trent. This farm has remained in the family. That is where Mrs. Sorenson lives now.

The general has maintained a legal residence in South Dakota and voted there.

The general holds the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal, the Order of the British Empire, and the Order of Taeguk, and the Ulchi Medal of the Republic of Korea.

His last assignment, since 1954, was with the Korean Army.

UNITED STATES FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I feel that a few words are in order on the history and purpose of the eight brief speeches on foreign policy which I have been delivering on the Senate floor.

For many years past it has seemed clear to me that all relations between men are governed by the moral law. If that law is obeyed, successful and constructive cooperation results. If the law is disobeyed, the result is conflict and confusion.

It is furthermore my conviction that the law is effective between groups and associations of people as well as between individuals. It controls the results of social, business, and political relations. It is the determining factor in the relations of nations with each other.

This conviction was examined and set forth in my recently published book, *Letter to a Generation*. Since it is my belief that the moral law governs much of our legislative responsibility, it was incumbent upon me to bring the subject to the attention of my fellow Senators. The distribution of the book was made in the hope of setting forth, even through a glass darkly, the eternal principles which underlie our work.

These eight brief talks go a step further. They are intended to illustrate the application of the moral law to the pertinent items in a series of problems in the field of international relations. Until and unless further light comes to me these conclusions must govern my voice and vote in the next Congress, no matter how high the administrative authority may be which seeks to persuade us to other conclusions.

Such a statement of purpose has the appearance of self-righteousness. This is in appearance only, if the moral law is rightly interpreted, for all—angels, principalities and powers—are subject to it. The statement then loses its self-righteous aspect and becomes a very practical matter, for the law tells us what will work and what will fail.

This subject must be approached by us in humility rather than in self-righteousness. Our God-given intelligence will be taxed. Some of our undertakings have little moral content. They are purely mechanical or organizational. Other pieces of legislation have a smaller or larger moral content which we are bound to take into account. The great policies have almost completely a moral content. They can work successfully only if grounded in the moral law.

If these principles can be brought clearly into the focus of our legislative vision, the purposes of the book and of these brief talks will have been accomplished.

VI. THE ENSLAVED NATIONS

There are behind the Iron Curtain 14 millions of square miles of territory and 90 millions of people who a generation ago lived in freedom. Now they are enslaved. They can express and act upon no will of their own, except as that will may chance to coincide with that of their masters, the Soviet rulers. As individuals they have been subjected to arbitrary arrest in the middle of the night,

without trial or explanation. As people they have been subject to mass deportation, to serve the economic plans of their masters. That this condition should exist so flagrantly and on so large a scale is against the national self-interest of the United States.

Let me again define that self-interest. It lies in so directing our words and our acts that we may assist in organizing a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail. This is the kind of a world we would bequeath to our children and grandchildren. This is the basic statement of our national interest and everything else is subsidiary.

Such a purpose as this is contravened by the continued existence of the nations enslaved behind the curtain.

This curtain is a most significant thing. It is important in two ways. It gives evidence that there is something to conceal, within or without. What is within? It can be used to conceal military preparations which are not in accordance with protestations and possible agreements relating to disarmament. This would be an untenable use of the curtain for a government seeking disarmament.

More likely, also, free communication would both reveal social and economic weakness within, and likewise reveal to those within the better life that is lived without. In any case the curtain is a sign and a symbol of an inner weakness in the Soviet empire. No modern government resting on firm foundations would find it necessary to guard its people from knowledge of and contacts with the outside world.

These considerations give the clue to our best service to the enslaved people. By every means of communication we must continually assure them of our concern for them. Without inciting them to a hopeless uprising, we should maintain their hope and courage.

Such passive resistance as may recommend itself to their own judgment is very much in order. The Soviet Government must never be allowed to feel at ease with regard to its unwilling satellites and we must play our part in sustaining uneasiness.

Above all, we must never be persuaded to abandon the means of communication, whether by radio, balloons, or what have you. We must not agree to disarm ourselves psychologically and spiritually. Specious arguments for thus disarming ourselves have been made and will be made ever more strongly. Let us not listen to them. We are engaged in a psychological and spiritual war for the benefit of all people, within or without the curtain. It would be folly to disarm ourselves of these weapons.

Lincoln told us that our Nation could not exist half slave and half free. Can we expect the world to exist as a fit place for our children if it is half slave and half free?

Our next step is to consider all the means of psychological and spiritual offensive against this new colonialism, this new slavery. The possibilities of such an offensive will be the subject of the next talk in this series.

VII. ENCIRCLEMENT AND PENETRATION

Mr. President, in the preceding talks of this series, there have been discussed most of the elements of our opposition to the conquest of the world by the evil forces of Soviet communism. It is now in order to combine those elements into considered and enduring policy.

One of the elements of that policy is military strength. This must be more than a background strength. It must be a force in being, particularly in the air arm, for any major attack must be expected from the air. We must strengthen our defenses and likewise our power of retaliatory offense. In view of all the past history of the aggressive force with which we are faced, in view of the representations made in Asia by the Soviet leaders at the very moment of the much advertised New Look, we can place no trust in the moral effect on them of exemplary disarmament, or any relaxation in vigilance on our part. We are in this thing in deadly earnest.

Along with this determination must go a willingness and deep desire to achieve a peaceful world of disarmed nations. This objective will be discussed in the last talk of this series. Let it here be said that this will not be reached by weakness. Only through armament lies the road to disarmament.

However necessary powerful armament may be, its uses are limited to defense, and particularly to the gaining of time in which more constructive policies may be applied. Again we return to the wise dictum of our great strategist, Admiral Mahan, repeated from the first of these talks, "The purpose of military power is to provide time for moral ideas to take root." What are the moral ideas?

There is a moral law in the universe which governs all the relations of men with men, whether as individuals, or as groups organized in societies, business, governments, or nations. The moral law has existed since men were men. It has set forth from the beginning of human history the terms on which men may work together constructively in any human effort. It is as valid in human relations as are the physical laws in the realm of matter and energy.

We may learn the strength of the moral law by the bumbling process of trial and error, or by the more effective method of applying intelligent analysis to experience. But there is a third and more direct way. Its terms have been directly apprehended by prophets and seers since the beginning of history. We do well to sit at their feet. For Christians the revelation comes from the Divine Source itself, and is most clearly stated in the Golden Rule from the Sermon on the Mount and in the answer to the young lawyer in the 23d chapter of Matthew.

These are not counsels of perfection; they are not moral ideals. They are the facts of life. Let us put them to the test.

The aspect of the Soviet system as seen from without is that of well-nigh irresistible power. That power is illusory, for the impressive facade is based upon and conceals moral weakness. There is no place in the Soviet system for the recognition of men as brothers. There is no recognition of the worth, or even the ex-

istence, of the human soul. In broad terms the government does not exist for its citizens. Men exist for the benefit of the state and its current rulers, whoever they may chance to be. Thus men are depressed to the level of materials to be processed or, at best, of tools to be used. The net result is a new and more vicious colonialism. It is the institution of a more radical slavery, which denies the soul, enchains the mind, and directs all human effort toward the achievement of a global empire.

Yet this vast enterprise, based as it is on a denial of the moral law, is therefore weak in its foundations and rotten at the heart. If we understand this, we possess the key to its arrest and eventual reconstruction. The means available to us are moral encirclement and moral penetration.

Military encirclement has little value against a central power which, on short lines, can threaten spots on a vast circumference, where for us distances are great and transportation difficult. Furthermore, around this vast periphery, the present Soviet advances are not now being made by any immediate use of military power. Their weapons are the more subtle ones of economic and psychological penetration. Against these we can prevail through a wise and discriminating use of economic strength, as already suggested, and through a wise moral encirclement, as distinguished from a difficult military one.

By moral encirclement we mean a worldwide, geographically continuous group of nations devoted to the wellbeing of people, considerate of the worth and dignity of the human soul, and joined in the common endeavor to achieve justice, peace and freedom.

While moral encirclement is a major move in the strategy of waging peace, it is by definition not a harmful or hostile move. While it exerts pressure, the pressure is not physical but spiritual. Finally the applying of moral pressure is not a moral drain on the nation that applies it. It builds up; it does not weaken or destroy.

If the encircling ring is to hold, its component nations must seek peace in terms of freedom and justice. Their governments ultimately must be devoted to the wellbeing of peoples rather than to the accumulation of power. Finally, these nations must respect one another and learn to work together.

It is the part of the United States to refine its relationships with cooperating nations. We must be miserly with words of propaganda. Within our means we must be generous with helpful action. Our assistance is not to be given as a bribe for agreement with our plans or withheld as a punishment for noncompliance. We wish all peoples to rise to better living conditions. We will work with them to this end—without domination, without compulsion, without self-righteousness.

The first requirement of such a program is that we ourselves shall obey the moral law in all our relations with other nations, and particularly with those engaged with us in the moral encirclement. This is a determining responsibility laid upon the Congress and the administra-

tion of this country. It rests particularly upon the Senate of the United States, in all of its deliberations relating to foreign policy. There is a particular importance in making our services of information more effective.

An excellent example of an unsuccessful attack on moral encirclement is offered by the recent visit of Bulganin and Khrushchev to England. Here the moral defenses are strong. The invaders made no breach in them, even at the point which had seemed weakest—the organization of the Labor Party. When the attack was made, the defenses were found impregnable. The experiences of the Soviet leaders in England and India present an instructive contrast and a hopeful lesson. It shows the difference between strong and weak or absent moral bulwarks. Burma, as we have seen, presents another example. Being without moral defenses, that country has yielded to invasion. But now, we hope not too late, Premier U Nu has recognized the danger and seeks to construct the needed defense.

Moral encirclement is defensive. It opposes a moral wall against the inherently weak forces of Soviet propaganda. We need also an offensive force. This we have in moral penetration.

It is a commonplace concept in the minds of American youth that our country has no designs on the territory and resources of the Russian people. We raise no questions as to this. We have no reservations whatsoever. It would be unutterably silly for us to look with covetousness at that remote, enormous stretch of the earth's territory, so unnecessary to our physical well-being. We can have for the people of Russia nothing but good will, however we may be opposed to the purposes of their Government.

That the people of Russia do not believe this is the tragedy of our times. Day and night, year in and year out, these people are told that we are their enemies, that we are planning to invade them, that they must arm themselves against us.

The Soviet rulers have sought to assure the reign of falsehood in their empire by erecting the Iron Curtain to keep out truth. Communist China has followed suit with its Bamboo Curtain. These curtains are necessary if communism is to survive in Russia or China. Piercing them with the truth is a major means of waging peace.

This necessary undertaking is not simple. It can be accomplished for the present only fragmentarily and as occasion arises. But we must never falter in this purpose.

The need for such communications is great. I have already dwelt on their application to the enslaved peoples of the satellites. They must be directed to the Russian people as well. These communications must be friendly and perthe satellites. They must be directed to persuasively to the Soviet rulers themselves, for a radical change in their policy which redirects their efforts toward advancing the well-being of their own people might well be in their own long-range self-interest.

It has been my high privilege from time to time to address the people—and rulers—of Russia along these lines. A talk on Thanksgiving Day 1954, is to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 12, page 16184. Again at the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Helsinki in August of last year, I addressed the Soviet delegation. This is to be found on page A2162 of this year's daily RECORD. My most recent broadcast was on the occasion of the Russian Easter which occurred on May 5 of this year. I have the script of this talk with me and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the body of the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

Such a program as this, vigorously pursued, will have good results. We do know that radio messages get through. The secret evidence of this cannot be denied. Jamming of the radio frequencies goes on hour after hour, but frequent changes of our wavelength, the freakish behavior of the ionic overcast, and other incidents and accidents give entrance to the Voice of America. We know that it is eagerly listened to.

There is no intent in this to stir up revolution in Russia. That would be fatal. The men of Moscow know how to handle armed resistance. But the gradual growth among their subjects of the suspicion that they are being deceived will be difficult for the leaders to control.

Various friends have objected to a vigorous moral campaign. Some call it a "holy war" and therefore mad policy. Of course it is in a sense a "holy war" but it is of a new kind. It harms no one and it is waged in support of human well-being on both sides of the battle line. In such a "holy war" we may be proud to engage.

Another objection is that this puts us in the objectionable role of the self-righteous. This would be true if our morality were a robe to be put on and taken off. The morality of which we are talking is a recognition of the facts of life. We are no more pharisaical than the engineer is intellectually snobbish, when he follows physical law in devising mechanisms for meeting the needs of mankind.

I believe that all Senators have received copies of my recent book, *Letter To a Generation*. Those who have had the time and inclination to read into it have found that the basic ideas of these talks have there been more fully discussed.

The last talk of this series will be entitled "The Necessity and Practicability of Disarmament."

VIII. THE NECESSITY AND PRACTICABILITY OF DISARMAMENT

Disarmament has been a dream of the idealist for many years. That men should kill each other by governmental authority and command has seemed outrageous—as it is. Yet when the opposed purposes of sovereign nations find no solution in diplomacy, then the resort to arms is the final arbiter if there is a national determination to bring matters to a conclusion.

Two generations ago a World Court was devised as a substitute for the field of battle. This has proved useful in minor

matters, but the major disputes are not referred to it and it has no means of enforcing its decisions.

The First World War raised the curtain on the horrors of modern conflict. It introduced the airplane and the tank and made large use of poison gas. This disturbing view of the future led to valueless treaties for outlawing war and to the first practical attempt to limit armaments. The Naval Treaty of 1922 between England, Japan, France, Italy, and the United States resulted in our sinking of a substantial part of our Navy, the arrest of further shipbuilding abroad, but in the ultimate circumvention of the treaty terms, particularly by Japan.

The multiplied atrocities of World War II, and particularly our unveiling of the atom bomb, made more clearly evident the necessity for the control of warfare. Collective security in the United Nations seemed to be the best solution.

Then we devised the hydrogen bomb; the Soviet Government followed suit, and it became evident that there is no collective security in the face of nations or individual rulers reckless enough to set fire to a fuse which sparks the destruction of our civilization. That destruction has become a practical possibility. Disarmament becomes a necessity. But is it a hopeless necessity?

The answer is "No."

Let it first be recognized that disarmament as the specific goal is not enough. There could conceivably be a disarmed world (disarmed as measured by modern standards) in which freedom, justice, and peace do not prevail. There are then needed additional terms for a really effective disarmament.

One requirement is the opening of the boundaries of the nations, including our own, to effective inspection of progress in carrying out the terms of any disarmament agreement.

There is likewise required the establishment of that minimum of supranational government which will adjudicate international disputes and police its decisions. It will have no authority to go into domestic questions such as tariffs and immigration. Those are matters for the people of each nation to decide.

This is not the time or place to go into the other terms of an effective disarmament agreement, except to say that it must be universal, complete, and controlled. This is the time and place to consider how such an agreement can be arrived at. The two great obstacles to such an agreement are the people of the United States and the rulers of the Soviet Government. With willingness and determination evident in these two quarters, the world will follow gladly. Let us first consider our own problem.

Two means of persuading ourselves are obvious. They are terror and taxes.

It is well that our people should be terrified at the prospect of destruction by the hydrogen bomb in irresponsible hands. The destruction of our civilization is more than a possibility. It is perilously near to a probability if the present trend of history runs its course.

Terror is as yet not really effective. If it were, we would be more in earnest about the diffusion of people and industries, even though only a portion

can be safeguarded by this policy. If it were, we would all engage with determination in the exercise of civil defense, even though great masses of the population could not be saved. Terror is a realistic factor, but the human mind is so constructed that terror cannot be maintained, nor perhaps should it be. Yet it must be preserved in the back of the mind as an effective determinant of policy when policy comes up for consideration.

Taxes are another matter. If we give clear consideration to our condition, we will neither reduce taxes nor the national debt so long as the present emergency continues. We will strengthen our defenses of early warning, intercepting planes and ground-to-air missiles. We will improve and multiply our offensive of atomic-driven bombers, atomic submarine launching platforms, long-range ballistic missiles with atomic warheads and all the other means of offensive terror, military and political. This will mean taxes on taxes. We must take it and like it, for it serves to solve the next problem, that of convincing the Soviet leadership.

If we are to arrive with them at a durable, organized peace in the world there must be no letdown on our part, whatever smiles and friendly gestures they may display. Our military defenses must be as nearly impassable as it is possible to make them. We must let them know that we are prepared to use tactical atomic weapons against aggression. Our offensive measures must give them the gravest concern. The road to disarmament of necessity passes through armament.

We likewise must build and strengthen the moral encirclement. Our efforts at moral penetration must be intense and unrelenting. It will be folly to give up radio broadcasts, balloons, or any other effective means of reaching the peoples behind the curtain. To give up here is to give up the search for a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail.

There will be subsidiary questions to be decided as we go along. For instance, can an effective agreement to cease the development of the intercontinental ballistic missile be arrived at and would such an agreement help or hinder reaching the ultimate objective? Would the settlement of the German dilemma by voluntary disarmament help or hinder? These and other questions must be solved in the light of our ultimate purposes.

That purpose is to save our civilization from impending destruction. This is not a hopeless undertaking, for a very good reason indeed. If the rulers of the Soviet once get a clear picture of their own long-range self-interest, that interest will be found identical with ours. On that basis we can work together. To the establishment of that basis we must bend our every effort.

Disarmament and the replacement of war by viable judicial and administrative processes constitute the prime ingredient in our national interest as it has been defined in these brief speeches. In the judgment of your speaker disarmament can only be reached by effort on the broad front which has been described. Here we have something which

ries above the technical discussions recently held in London.

The whole strategy is that of identifying ourselves with the world's people, military strength in being, moral encirclement, encouragement to the enslaved nations, and penetrating the curtain with messages of cooperation with the Russian people for their and our good. No one of those procedures must be sidestepped or neglected. If we pursue them with diligence, it then becomes possible and important to measure our progress on this broad front from time to time. The best means for doing this would seem to be the holding of recurrent "meetings at the summit." They should be held at least once a year to test the effect of our offense and defense.

It would seem wise to add to the governments who are represented there by their heads of state. Would not clearer understandings and better cooperation be reached if Germany, India, Canada, and Australia were invited to join the panel?

If we keep up the moral pressure and remain true to the moral law, it may well be that future conferences would reveal progress beyond anything that we now deem possible. For this we need a more powerful stimulus than terror and taxes, useful though they may be. The great stimulus will be our earnest concern with the world into which our children and grandchildren are entering. For them we will daily pray that we may attain a world in which freedom, justice, and peace prevail.

Having so prayed, we will rise to our feet and seek by all means to bring our prayer to its fulfillment.

EASTER MESSAGE BY SENATOR FLANDERS TO THE PEOPLE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an Easter message which I delivered last Easter to the Russian people.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Because of the differences in our church calendars, we in America held our Easter on April 1 this year. You are holding yours now. For you and for us this celebration of the resurrection of Christ is a period of thanksgiving, of hope, and of joy. The dark winter is over. The trees put out their leaves. Plants spring anew from both the earth of Russia and America with their promise of future flower and fruit.

This is the time for us to talk together as brothers in the endeavor to end the long winter of suspicion, of hostility, which has resulted in crushing burdens on all peoples in their support of preparations for war.

First, let us explain in a few words our reasons for arming. Following World War II, which we all fought against Hitler, 10 million American soldiers returned to their families and freely engaged in gainful work on their farms and in factories and stores. In recent years also free nations turned their colonial lands over to the 500 million human beings who live in those areas. On the other hand, following World War II, your Government conquered and absorbed the Baltic States,

Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, Bulgaria, and Rumania. Nearly 100 million persons who had once been free to choose their own governments became subject to your rulers.

It was necessary for us to build up a counterforce against further aggression. This we have done and this is why we are now armed. The military bases established by us in cooperation with other countries do not threaten you but protect us against a similar fate which befell the hundred million people I have just mentioned. This is why you and we devote such immense treasure in our natural resources and the work of our people to the wasteful support of armed strength. We and you want to change this foolish policy and devote our resources and work to the happiness of our people. How can we do it?

The first thing we need to do is to remove fear. You need have no fear of us. Our people have no interests which conflict with those of the people of Russia. We do not need more land. What land we have raises an abundance of grain and fiber, and of the flesh of beasts. We have great forests and rich deposits of ore. Our seas teem with fish. Everything we need we have, or can obtain by freely trading for it from our own abundance. What we do want is peace and freedom.

That we want peace with friendly people must have been apparent to your delegation of farming experts, as well as other groups, who visited the United States last year to see how our people till their soil and breed their livestock.

In short, self-interest forbids that we should seek conquests, whether political or economic. I am talking with you today, hoping for your understanding that the same self-interest of your government leaders will dissolve tensions and lead to the abandonment of armies and armament as the main support of the foreign policy of your nation.

I am speaking to the rulers of Russia as well as to you, the people. Is it not reasonable to believe that the leaders of the Soviet Government who will most strongly establish themselves in the future will be the men who make the greatest contribution to the personal well-being of the Russian people? Can there be a more stable basis for government than a successful program for providing more and better food, better clothing and housing, and better educational opportunities for the people?

Dependence on military force works against this well-being. The enormous military programs result in less and poorer food and clothing, inadequate housing, and lowered opportunities. Armies, supported in readiness for attack from without, are in the meantime opposing the happiness of the people within. Disarmament should be the great objective of the people everywhere.

It may be argued that for the Soviet Government armed forces are essential to hold in subjection the satellites I have mentioned. But if there is to be no attack from without, the ring of satellites is unnecessary. Nor are those satellites economically profitable to Russia as virtual colonies. No people, formerly free, will be productive in subjection. Slave labor is uneconomical. A free people, benefiting from their own enterprise, is infinitely more profitable as a neighbor than is the most cowed and subjugated horde of conscripts. In the theory and practice of our system of personal freedom and individual self-reliance, a continuously expanding commerce leads to growing benefits to those who buy and to those who sell. Again, in a word—the same word—your self-interest decrees the freeing of the people of the satellites of the Soviet Union.

Bountiful blessings for the peoples of the earth and for their rulers depend on the establishment of disarmament—complete, uni-

versal, and controlled—and on the acceptance of the kind and degree of governmental cooperation required to administer it. The negotiations to this end now underway will be long and difficult. They must be pursued with faith and diligence. Above all, as a practical matter, these negotiations must be continued on the basis of long-range self-interest. Otherwise they will fail.

Therefore, let this Easter of the year 1956 be the day on which the Russian and American people and the Russian and American Governments determine that they will join together to contribute to the well-being of the peoples of our two lands. Nothing must stand in the way of this. It requires mutual discussions in a new spirit. If it requires, as it will, a greater openness of communication, of travel, of mutual personal contacts, let us move towards this also.

Not merely for Russia and for America but for the world, the hope and the joy of Easter must be made manifest and effective through these ways to peace.

ADDITIONAL REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

By unanimous consent, the following additional reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURRAY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

H. R. 7732. An act to amend section 402 (c) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, with respect to the coloring of oranges (Rept. No. 2391).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3875. A bill to amend section 4 (a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, as amended (Rept. No. 2392); and

H. R. 11802. An act to continue the effectiveness of the act of December 2, 1942, as amended, and the act of July 28, 1945, as amended, relating to war-risk hazard and detention benefits until July 1, 1957 (Rept. No. 2393).

By Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without amendment:

S. 3956. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 2394).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, without amendment:

S. 4146. A bill providing for a Civilian Atomic Power Acceleration Program (Rept. No. 2390).

Mr. ANDERSON subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], for himself, the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and myself, introduced the bill (S. 4146) to provide for a civilian atomic power acceleration program.

I ask unanimous consent to have the bill printed in the RECORD at this point, together with a copy of a press release issued today by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

There being no objection, the bill and press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4146

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the Atomic Power Acceleration Amendment of 1956.

Sec. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating chap-

ter 19 as chapter 20, and inserting a new chapter 19 reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 19. ACCELERATED ATOMIC POWER PROGRAM

"SEC. 241. Purpose and policy:

"(a) It is the purpose of the United States and of this chapter:

"(1) To encourage the continued development of atomic power technology and the advancement of the art through practical experience in the development and operation of prototype atomic powerplants;

"(2) To achieve economic atomic power as rapidly as practicable;

"(3) To advance the spirit of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the Atoms for Peace plan.

"(b) (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to accelerate the civilian atomic power program and maintain leadership in atomic power technology by the construction of additional demonstration prototype reactors for domestic use and foreign applications at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art.

"(2) The accelerated program authorized by this chapter shall be carried out under the provisions of section 31, and shall be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under this act, including sections 31 and 104.

"SEC. 242. In order to implement the policy established in section 241, the Commission is authorized and directed as follows:

"(a) Accelerated power reactor program:

"(1) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of large-scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities designed to demonstrate the practical value of utilization facilities for the generation of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

"(2) The selection of design for such reactor facilities shall be made on the basis of a determination that development, construction, and operation of a facility so designed offers promise of making a contribution to the advance of the art and technology of the large-scale production of atomic power in the form of electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

"(3) The power reactor demonstration facilities authorized by this subsection shall be constructed at sites of major production facilities operated by or on behalf of the Commission, and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such production facility.

"(b) Advanced design and development program:

"(1) The Commission shall proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology.

"(2) As soon as practicable, consistent with the development of appropriate designs, the Commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract of prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts, such reactors to be capable of producing not to exceed 50,000 kilowatts of electricity.

"(c) Foreign atomic power assistance: In order effectively to carry out the atoms for peace plan of the United States, the Commission shall have responsibility for the conduct of a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the design, construction, and operation of power reactors and related matters. The planning and execution of such a program shall be undertaken as rapidly as practicable.

"(d) Supporting facilities: The Commission is authorized to construct, own, and op-

erate supporting facilities necessary in connection with projects initiated under subsections a, b, and c of this section.

"(e) Quarterly report: The Commission shall report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy quarterly beginning January 1, 1957, on the progress under the acceleration program."

SEC. 3. Chapter 19 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is redesignated as chapter 20 and sections 241 and 251 of this act are redesignated respectively as sections 251 and 252, making appropriate amendment to the table of contents.

SEC. 4. Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the figure "\$319,595,000" in section 101 thereof and inserting the figure "\$719,595,000."

(b) By adding at the end of section 101 (c) thereof a new subsection reading:

"11. Project 57-c-11, Civilian atomic power acceleration program, \$400,000,000."

[From offices of Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, No. 61, June 29, 1956]

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy has favorably reported out a bill designed to accelerate the civilian reactor program in this country and to encourage a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the field of atomic power, it was announced today by Committee Chairman CLINTON P. ANDERSON. The motion to report out the bill was made by Senator PASTORE, Democrat, of Rhode Island, and was seconded by Representative CARL HINSHAW, Republican, of California, and was approved by a substantial majority of the Committee.

The bill calls for the construction of additional large scale demonstration prototype reactors "at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art." The accelerated program would be conducted under the research and development provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and would be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under the act. The prototype reactors would be constructed at AEC production sites and the electric energy generated is to be used by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the operation of its production facilities.

In addition to the accelerated power reactor program, the AEC is directed to "proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology," and "as soon as practicable" to construct small prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts. Reactors constructed under both the demonstration and development program would be carried out under contract with private concerns.

In commenting on this latter provision Senator ANDERSON stated:

"This bill will broaden the base of private industrial participation in the atomic power program and will offer a great opportunity to those firms not presently participating in the program to contribute their efforts and talents."

Total funds authorized for the proposed program would be \$400 million.

AGREEMENTS ENTERED INTO BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, from time to time I have reported to the Senate on the receipt of various agreements

of cooperation by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, which have been entered into by the United States and foreign governments for the development of atomic energy. In accordance with the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, these agreements are required to lie before the joint committee for 30 days before they can become effective.

During the last session of Congress, on behalf of the joint committee, I introduced into the record a large number of agreements for cooperation for research purposes. Today I would like to introduce into the record the research agreements which have most recently come before the joint committee. These agreements are with the Republic of Cuba, which arrived June 22; with France, which arrived June 14; with the Dominican Republic, which arrived June 15; with New Zealand, which arrived June 15; with Austria, which arrived June 12; with Costa Rica, which arrived May 22. These agreements are basically identical with the research agreements last year, except that they provide for a small additional amount of special nuclear material for research purposes, and they provide for a clause holding the United States harmless in the construction and operation of the research reactors abroad. I should also point out that the French agreement contemplates the transfer of more special nuclear material under the research agreement than was the case with respect to the agreements last year. Where those agreements contemplated the transfer of 6 kilograms, the French transfer contemplates 40 kilograms of Uranium-235, enriched to 20 percent. It also permits there to be 6 kilograms of Uranium-235 having a 90-percent enrichment.

Last year the Commission entered into the agreements with Great Britain, Canada, and Belgium. These were the first major agreements for cooperation and were signed with our wartime partners. On June 15 an amendment to the British agreement arrived before the joint committee. This amendment would increase the amounts of special nuclear material transferable under the agreement for industrial purposes; would permit the disclosure of restricted data relating to the propulsion of submarines, ships, and aircraft, and also adds a hold harmless clause. On June 26, a similar amendment to the Canadian agreement arrived before the joint committee.

On June 18 the first of a series of power bilaterals arrived before the joint committee. This agreement is with Australia. It provides for the transfer of restricted data dealing with power bilaterals for the transfer of up to 500 kilograms of U-235, with a small portion of that available as U-235, enriched up to 90 percent, for a test reactor, and for the cooperation in the production of uranium ores and concentrates. Similar power agreements with Switzerland and the Netherlands arrived on June 20.

I request unanimous consent to have copies of all of these agreements printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the agreements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Cuba;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and the Republic of Cuba on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of the radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The Republic of Cuba, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to the Republic of Cuba. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Cuba up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Cuba or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict the Republic of Cuba in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You will also note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to the Republic of Cuba under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by the Republic of Cuba to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 22, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 21, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Republic of Cuba and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that

the Government of the Republic of Cuba desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Cuba enclosed with your letter of June 21.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Cuba, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the Republic of Cuba and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Cuba, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Cuba. No restricted data would be communicated

under this agreement, and the Government of the Republic of Cuba has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Cuba up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Cuba.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Cuba and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF CUBA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Cuba desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of Cuba desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy, for which purpose, by decree No. 177 of June 22, 1955, it has created the Nuclear Energy Commission of Cuba, and further desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry in connection with this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of the Republic of Cuba in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or

reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The term "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of Restricted Data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of the Republic of Cuba, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the Republic of Cuba may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the Republic of Cuba to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Republic of Cuba or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U-235 leased by the Commission require replacement they shall be returned to the Com-

mission, and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Republic of Cuba, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct materials, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Republic of Cuba by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cuba, by reason of transfer under this article, be at any one time in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-235.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in the Republic of Cuba. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Republic of Cuba may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of the Republic of Cuba and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the Republic of Cuba to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of Cuba.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of the Republic of Cuba decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of the Republic of Cuba agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of the Republic of Cuba will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Republic of Cuba may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Republic of Cuba, the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of the Republic of Cuba guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Republic of Cuba or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of Cuba except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in the Republic of Cuba.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of the Republic of Cuba shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing

reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the Republic of Cuba and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and Spanish languages, this ———.

En testimonio de lo cual, las Partes contratantes han convenido la conclusion de este convenio, debidamente autorizados a tal efecto.

Hecho en Washington, en duplicado, en los idiomas ingles y español,

For the Government of the United States of America:

Por el Gobierno de los Estados Unidos de America:

AEC—WLA—June 21, 1956.

SD—TM—June 21, 1956.

For the Government of the Republic of Cuba:

Por el Gobierno de la Republica de Cuba:

OA—June 21, 1956.

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on
Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed Agreement for Cooperation with the Government of the Republic of France;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approved the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

The proposed agreement will permit cooperation between France and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. No restricted data will be exchanged under this agreement. Under the proposed agreement the Commission would, however, sell to the Government of the Republic of France uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous use of the reactors involved. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. You will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Source or special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article V of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 19, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 18, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the Republic of France and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the development, design, construction and operation of research, experimental power, and power reactors, including related health and safety problems; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. It is provided that no restricted data will be exchanged under this agreement.

I have noted that the agreement would permit the Commission to sell U-235 to France for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactors constructed in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that the Commission may in its discretion make a portion of the foregoing 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. I note that the agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses and in addition, article VIII provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article VI of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume

the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 18, 1956.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Governments of the Republic of France and the United States of America, and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in France in accordance with the policy which you have established. As you will note, the agreement is designed to facilitate cooperation between the two countries with respect to the development, design, construction, operation, and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors, health and safety problems related to the operation and use of such reactors, and the use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

France, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research, experimental power and power reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to France. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, and the Government of France has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

The proposed agreement would permit the United States to sell the Government of France contained U-235 in uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 for use as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects in France. The quantity of such material which will be transferred and in the custody of the Government of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient, continuous use of the reactors involved. The Commission also may, at its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 40 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a

materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

The quantity of the U-235 that will be transferred under this agreement will be made available pursuant to your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U-235 available to friendly foreign countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VIII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed by the Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article V of the agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established. Article XII also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of France and the United States and placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
REPUBLIC OF FRANCE CONCERNING CIVIL USES
OF ATOMIC ENERGY

PREAMBLE

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research and experimental activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Republic of France desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and the United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, represented by the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to

assist the Government of the Republic of France in such a program;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For purposes of this agreement:

A. "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Commissariat" means the French Commissariat à l'Energie Atomique.

C. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

D. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

E. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

F. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear materials; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

G. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

H. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

I. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Republic of France or the Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Republic of France or the Commission may determine from time to time.

J. "Parties" means the Government of the Republic of France and the Government of the United States of America, including the Commissariat on behalf of the Government of the Republic of France and the Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above "parties."

ARTICLE II

This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE III

A. Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such service involves the communication of restricted data.

B. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their

respective countries, the parties shall assist each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

C. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately owned or has been received from another government.

ARTICLE IV

Subject to the provisions of article III, information in the specific fields set out below shall be exchanged between the Commission and the Commissariat with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses, and problems of health and safety connected therewith:

A. The development, design, construction, operation and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors;

B. Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research, experimental power, and power reactors;

C. The use of radioactive isotopes and radiation in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture and industry.

ARTICLE V

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications) and any material, equipment, and devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, materials, equipment, and devices for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE VI

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy as provided by article IV and under the limitations set forth in article III, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of either party, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or France may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Republic of France will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The limitations in article III;

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France.

ARTICLE VIII

A. The Commission will sell to the Government of the Republic of France uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental power, and power reactor projects which the Government of the Republic of France, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in France, and as required in experiments related thereto.

B. The sale of the uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this Article shall be in such form as may be mutually agreed, and at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed, and subject to the other terms and conditions of this agreement.

C. 1. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Republic of France shall not at any time be in excess of 40 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235 plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in France or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 40 kilograms of said material.

2. The Commission may, upon request and at its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing material available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

3. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Republic of France will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in France, the Government of the Republic of France will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the Commission until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the Commission in either Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission or the facilities acceptable to the Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of France's need for such material in its program for the peacetime uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the United States, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE IX

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article IV, and under the limitations set forth in article III, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, other than special nuclear material, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE X

The Government of the United States and the Government of the Republic of France emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Republic of France pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic-energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission;

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available:

(i) Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the Commission.

(ii) Reactors.

(iii) Any other equipment or device designated by the Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Republic of France or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guarantees set forth in article XI.

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in France and which is not purchased pursuant to article VIII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VIII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the Parties.

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Republic of France, personnel who, accompanied if either party

so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Republic of France, shall have access in France to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article, or the guarantees set forth in article XI, and the failure of the Government of the Republic of France to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article.

6. To consult with the Government of the Republic of France in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Republic of France undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XI

The Government of the Republic of France guarantees that:

A. Safeguards provided in article X shall be maintained:

B. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Republic of France or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale or otherwise, and no special nuclear material produced as a result of such transfer will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Republic of France except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE XII

A. The Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of France affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

1. The Parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this Agreement for Cooperation. In particular, the Parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards including those relating to health and safety standards required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

2. In the event the Parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this Article, either Party may by notification terminate this Agreement. In the event this Agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Republic of France shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this Agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Republic of France becomes a member of such an integrated group and if an agreement for

cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Republic of France to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Republic of France under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this Agreement.

In witness whereof the Parties hereto have caused this Agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, in the English and French languages, this ———.

En foi de quoi les Parties ont fait établir le présent accord en bonne et due forme en vertu des pouvoirs dûment conférés à cet effet.

Fait à Washington, en double exemplaire, en Anglais et en Français le ———.

For the Government of the United States of America.

Pour le Gouvernement des Etats-Unis D'Amerique.

For the Government of the Republic of France.

Pour le Gouvernement de la Republique Française.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 15, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Dominican Republic;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and the Dominican Republic on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The Dominican Republic, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to the Dominican Republic. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to the Dominican Republic up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Dominican Republic or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict the Dominican Republic in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You will also note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount

of special nuclear material which would be made available to the Dominican Republic under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by the Dominican Republic to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission, and article IX contains the guarantees prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS D. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Dominican Republic and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Dominican Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominican Republic enclosed with your letter of June 7, 1956.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and the Dominican Republic, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1956.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the Dominican Republic and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors, in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. The Dominican Republic, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to the Dominican Republic. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of the Dominican Republic has signified its agreement to the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to the Dominican Republic up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of the Dominican Republic and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF
AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE
DOMINICAN REPUBLIC CONCERNING CIVIL USES
OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Dominican Republic desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear

science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of the Dominican Republic desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of the Dominican Republic in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of the Dominican Republic, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and

conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of the Dominican Republic may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of the Dominican Republic shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of the Dominican Republic to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Dominican Republic shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Dominican Republic or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U-235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of the Dominican Republic, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of the Dominican Republic by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no cases, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of the Dominican Republic, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in the Dominican Republic. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Dominican Republic may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of

agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for, the Government of the Dominican Republic and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of the Dominican Republic to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominican Republic.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of the Dominican Republic decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of the Dominican Republic agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of the Dominican Republic will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of the Dominican Republic may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of the Dominican Republic, the Government of the Dominican Republic shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of the Dominican Republic or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of the Dominican Republic shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of the Dominican Republic or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of the Dominican Republic guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Dominican Republic or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this

agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Dominican Republic except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in the Dominican Republic.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the government of the Dominican Republic shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of the Dominican Republic and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 15th day of June 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY F. HOLLAND,
Assistant Secretary of State for
Inter-American Affairs.

LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic
Energy Commission.

For the Government of the Dominican Republic:

JOAQUÍN E. SALAZAR,
Ambassador of the Dominican Republic.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of New Zealand;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, authorizing its execution, and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and New Zealand on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems;

the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. New Zealand, if it is desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of this agreement, to render other assistance to New Zealand. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to New Zealand up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in New Zealand or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict New Zealand in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to New Zealand under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by New Zealand to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article II contains the guaranty prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of New Zealand desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of New Zealand special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby:

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of New Zealand enclosed with your letter of June 7, 1956.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and New Zealand, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT EISENHOWER.

JUNE 7, 1956.

The President,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of the United States of America" and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. New Zealand, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able under the agreement to render other assistance to New Zealand. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of New Zealand has signified its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to New Zealand up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in New Zealand.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of New Zealand and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF NEW ZEALAND CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of New Zealand desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of New Zealand desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of New Zealand in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the

responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of New Zealand uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of New Zealand, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of New Zealand uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of New Zealand may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of New Zealand shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of New Zealand to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of New Zealand shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in New Zealand or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U-235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in article VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of New Zealand, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of New Zealand by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of New Zealand, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it

deems appropriate, to the Government of New Zealand, or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in New Zealand. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or New Zealand may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of New Zealand and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of New Zealand to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of New Zealand.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of New Zealand decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of New Zealand agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of New Zealand will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic-energy materials which the Government of New Zealand may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of New Zealand, the Government of New Zealand shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of New Zealand or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of New Zealand shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) for any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to

the Government of New Zealand or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of New Zealand guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of New Zealand or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of New Zealand except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in New Zealand.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of New Zealand shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of New Zealand and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 13th day of June 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

WALTER S. ROBERTSON,
LEWIS L. STRAUSS.

For the Government of New Zealand:
L. K. MUNRO.

Certified to be a true copy.

JOHN P. TREVITHICK,
Chief, Agreements Branch,
Division of International Affairs.

JUNE 8, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Austria;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing

its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Austria on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Austria, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Austria. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Austria up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Austria or while fuel elements are in transit.

This expressed limitation will restrict Austria in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Austria under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Austria to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guarantees prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 7, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 4, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agree-

ment, but the Commission would lease to the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria special nuclear material for use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Austria enclosed with your letter of June 4, 1956,

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and the Federal Republic of Austria, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Federal Republic of Austria.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 4, 1956.

The President,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Austria and the Government of the United States of America," and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Austria, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Austria. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Austria has signified its agreement to the guarantees prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Austria up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233 and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Austria.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate authorities of Austria and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRIA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Austria desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy, and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Austria desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Austria in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "restricted data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radio active isotopes in chemical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Austria uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Austria, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Austria uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Austria may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Austria shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of Austria to comply with the provisions of this agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Austria shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Austria or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U-235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Austria, including source materials, special nuclear materials, by-product material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Austria by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Austria, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any time,

in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Austria. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Austria may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Austria and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Austria to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Austria.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Austria agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Austria agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Austria decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Austria agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Austria will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Austria may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Austria, the Government of Austria shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement, lease to the Government of Austria or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Austria shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause

whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Austria or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Austria guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Austria or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Austria except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Austria.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of Austria shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Austria and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this — day of —, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America: _____

For the Government of Austria: _____

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Costa Rica;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will

not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

This agreement, as executed, makes cooperation possible between the United States and Costa Rica on the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. Costa Rica, if it desired to do so, would be able to engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industries in the United States will be permitted, within the limits of the agreement, to render other assistance to Costa Rica. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement. The Atomic Energy Commission, however, would lease to Costa Rica up to six (6) kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Costa Rica or while fuel elements are in transit. This expressed limitation will restrict Costa Rica in determining the choice of reactor to be constructed to a research reactor.

You also will note that the agreement includes in article V provisions for the sale or transfer of research quantities of materials of interest in connection with defined research projects, which I described to you in my letter of March 30, 1956. The amount of special nuclear material which would be made available to Costa Rica under this agreement would not be important from the military point of view.

Article VIII of the proposed agreement records the obligations undertaken by Costa Rica to safeguard the special nuclear material to be leased by the Commission and article IX contains the guaranties prescribed by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act.

This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Sincerely,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, May 9, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of May 4, 1956, you informed me that the Atomic Energy Commission had recommended that I approve a proposed agreement between the Government of Costa Rica and the Government of the United States for cooperation concerning the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The agreement recites that the Government of Costa Rica desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States and United States industry with respect to this program.

I have examined the recommended agreement. It calls for cooperation between the two Governments with respect to the design, construction, and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture, and industry. The agreement contains all of the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act. No restricted data would be communicated under the agreement, but the Commission would lease to the Government of Costa Rica special nuclear material for

use as reactor fuel. In addition, the Commission would be permitted to sell or otherwise transfer limited quantities of such material, including U-233, U-235, and plutonium, for use in defined research projects related to the peaceful application of atomic energy.

Pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Costa Rica enclosed with your letter of May 4, 1956.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States.

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

It is my hope that this agreement represents but the first stage of cooperation in the field of atomic energy between the United States and Costa Rica, and that it will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to other peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

MAY 4, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed proposed agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Costa Rica and the Government of the United States of America", and authorize its execution.

This agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica in accordance with the policy which you have established. The agreement would permit cooperation between the two countries with respect to the design, construction and operation of research reactors, including related health and safety problems; the use of such reactors in medical therapy; and the use of radioactive isotopes in biology, medicine, agriculture and industry. Costa Rica, if it desires to do so, may engage United States companies to construct research reactors, and private industry in the United States will be able, under the agreement, to render other assistance to Costa Rica. No restricted data would be communicated under this agreement, and the Government of Costa Rica has signed its agreement to the guaranties prescribed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 which are a part of this agreement.

Further provisions permit the Atomic Energy Commission to lease to Costa Rica up to 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235. You will note that article V of this agreement would permit the transfer of limited amounts of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. This agreement expresses the hope and expectation of the two Governments that this first stage of cooperation will lead to further discussions and agreements relating to the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Costa Rica.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be formally executed by the appropriate

authorities of Costa Rica and the United States and then placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy in compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Respectfully,

_____, *Chairman.*

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF COSTA RICA CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

Whereas the peaceful uses of atomic energy hold great promise for all mankind; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Costa Rica desire to cooperate with each other in the development of such peaceful uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the design and development of several types of research reactors are well advanced; and

Whereas research reactors are useful in the production of research quantities of radioisotopes, in medical therapy and in numerous other research activities and at the same time are a means of affording valuable training and experience in nuclear science and engineering useful in the development of other peaceful uses of atomic energy including civilian nuclear power; and

Whereas the Government of Costa Rica desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of the peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy and desires to obtain assistance from the Government of the United States of America and United States industry with respect to this program; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America, acting through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, desires to assist the Government of Costa Rica in such a program;

The parties agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

For the purposes of this agreement:

(a) "Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission or its duly authorized representatives.

(b) "Equipment and devices" means any instrument or apparatus and includes research reactors, as defined herein, and their component parts.

(c) "Research reactor" means a reactor which is designed for the production of neutrons and other radiations for general research and development purposes, medical therapy, or training in nuclear science and engineering. The term does not cover power reactors, power demonstration reactors, or reactors designed primarily for the production of special nuclear materials.

(d) The terms "Restricted Data," "atomic weapon," and "special nuclear material" are used in this agreement as defined in the United States Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

ARTICLE II

Restricted data shall not be communicated under this agreement, and no materials or equipment and devices shall be transferred and no services shall be furnished under this agreement to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction if the transfer of any such materials or equipment and devices or the furnishing of any such services involves the communication of restricted data.

ARTICLE III

1. Subject to the provisions of article II, the parties hereto will exchange information in the following fields:

(a) Design, construction, and operation of research reactors and their use as research, development, and engineering tools and in medical therapy.

(b) Health and safety problems related to the operation and use of research reactors.

(c) The use of radioactive isotopes in physical and biological research, medical therapy, agriculture, and industry.

2. The application or use of any information or data of any kind whatsoever, including design drawings and specifications, exchanged under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party which receives and uses such information or data, and it is understood that the other cooperating party does not warrant the accuracy, completeness, or suitability of such information or data for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE IV

1. The Commission will lease to the Government of Costa Rica uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of research reactors which the Government of Costa Rica, in consultation with the Commission, decides to construct and as required in the agreed experiments related thereto. Also, the Commission will lease to the Government of Costa Rica uranium enriched in the isotope U-235, subject to the terms and conditions provided herein, as may be required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of such research reactors as the Government of Costa Rica may, in consultation with the Commission, decide to authorize private individuals or private organizations under its jurisdiction to construct and operate, provided the Government of Costa Rica shall at all times maintain sufficient control of the material and the operation of the reactor to enable the Government of Costa Rica to comply with the provisions of this Agreement and the applicable provisions of the lease arrangement.

2. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of Costa Rica shall not at any time be in excess of 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent U-235, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Costa Rica or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the 6 kilograms of said material.

3. When any fuel elements containing U-235 leased by the Commission require replacement, they shall be returned to the Commission and, except as may be agreed, the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the Commission.

4. The lease of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 under this article shall be at such charges and on such terms and conditions with respect to shipment and delivery as may be mutually agreed and under the conditions stated in articles VIII and IX.

ARTICLE V

Materials of interest in connection with defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy undertaken by the Government of Costa Rica, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes, will be sold or otherwise transferred to the Government of Costa Rica by the Commission for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall the quantity of special nuclear materials under the jurisdiction of the Government of Costa Rica, by reason of transfer under this article, be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

ARTICLE VI

Subject to the availability of supply and as may be mutually agreed, the Commission will sell or lease, through such means as it deems appropriate, to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, such reactor materials, other than special nuclear materials, as are not obtainable on the commercial market and which are required in the construction and operation of research reactors in Costa Rica. The sale or lease of these materials shall be on such terms as may be agreed.

ARTICLE VII

It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Costa Rica may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, with respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, the Government of the United States will permit persons under its jurisdiction to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the Government of Costa Rica and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the Government of Costa Rica to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, subject to:

(a) The provisions of article II.

(b) Applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements of the Government of the United States and the Government of Costa Rica.

ARTICLE VIII

1. The Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that the special nuclear materials received from the Commission shall be used solely for the purposes agreed in accordance with this agreement and to assure the safekeeping of this material.

2. The Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain such safeguards as are necessary to assure that all other reactor materials, including equipment and devices, purchased in the United States under this agreement by the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction shall be used solely for the design, construction, and operation of research reactors which the Government of Costa Rica decides to construct and operate and for research in connection therewith, except as may otherwise be agreed.

3. In regard to research reactors constructed pursuant to this agreement, the Government of Costa Rica agrees to maintain records relating to power levels of operation and burn-up of reactor fuels and to make annual reports to the Commission on these subjects. If the Commission requests, the Government of Costa Rica will permit Commission representatives to observe from time to time the condition and use of any leased material and to observe the performance of the reactor in which the material is used.

4. Some atomic energy materials which the Government of Costa Rica may request the Commission to provide in accordance with this arrangement are harmful to persons and property unless handled and used carefully. After delivery of such materials to the Government of Costa Rica, the Government of Costa Rica shall bear all responsibility, insofar as the Government of the United States is concerned, for the safe handling and use of such materials. With respect to any special nuclear materials or fuel elements which the Commission may, pursuant to this agreement lease to the Government of Costa Rica or to any private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction, the Government of Costa Rica shall indemnify and save harmless the Government of the United States against any and all liability (including third-party liability) from any cause whatsoever arising out of the production or fabrication, the ownership, the lease, and

the possession and use of such special nuclear materials or fuel elements after delivery by the Commission to the Government of Costa Rica or to any authorized private individual or private organization under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE IX

The Government of Costa Rica guarantees that:

(a) Safeguards provided in article VIII shall be maintained.

(b) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of Costa Rica or authorized persons under its jurisdiction, pursuant to this agreement, by lease, sale, or otherwise will be used for atomic weapons or for research on or development of atomic weapons or for any other military purposes, and that no such material, including equipment and devices, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of Costa Rica except as the Commission may agree to such transfer to another nation and then only if in the opinion of the Commission such transfer falls within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

ARTICLE X

It is the hope and expectation of the parties that this initial agreement for cooperation will lead to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors. Accordingly, the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the feasibility of an additional agreement for cooperation with respect to the production of power from atomic energy in Costa Rica.

ARTICLE XI

1. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 5 years.

2. At the expiration of this agreement or of any extension thereof the Government of Costa Rica shall deliver to the United States all fuel elements containing reactor fuels leased by the Commission and any other fuel materials leased by the Commission. Such fuel elements and such fuel materials shall be delivered to the Commission at a site in the United States designated by the Commission at the expense of the Government of Costa Rica, and such delivery shall be made under appropriate safeguards against radiation hazards while in transit.

In witness whereof the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington, in duplicate, this 18th day of May 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

HENRY F. HOLLAND,
Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

LOUIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of Costa Rica:

FERNANDO FOURNIER,
Ambassador of Costa Rica.

JUNE 14, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United

Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America," signed on June 15, 1955;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article 1 of this amendment, will permit the exchange of information between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The Amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes.

Article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to make specific arrangements under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The amendment is required specifically at this time to permit an exchange of uranium from the United Kingdom for uranium from the United States which will be highly enriched in the isotope U-235.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the agreement for cooperation, signed on June 15, 1955, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, D. C. June 13, 1956.

The Honorable L. L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 7, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America, which was signed on June 15, 1955.

The Commission's letter states that article 1 of the amendment is required at this time to permit the exchange of information, including restricted data, between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance, and that the Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

The letter also mentions that article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to

make specific arrangements under which special nuclear materials required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The permissible exchange under this article would be mutually beneficial to the atomic energy programs of both countries.

I have also noted that article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to information and material exchanged under the terms of the agreement.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both Governments.

Accordingly, pursuant to provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

1. Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 7, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached Amendment to the Agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the United States of America," which was signed on June 15, 1955. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article 1 of the amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and the United Kingdom on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes. This amendment has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State and is consistent with your expressed interest in the contemplated exchange of information. The Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the Restricted Data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light

of the foregoing facts the exchange of Restricted Data such as that provided in this Amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Article 2 of the amendment will permit the parties to make specific arrangements under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes may be exchanged for other materials. The amendment is required specifically at this time to permit an exchange of uranium from the United Kingdom for uranium from the United States which will be highly enriched in the isotope U-235. The Commission is of the opinion that both countries will obtain considerable benefit from this additional area of cooperation.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The Atomic Energy Commission believes that the execution of the enclosed amendment will be mutually advantageous to the United States and the United Kingdom and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States. The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the existing agreement for cooperation will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is the opinion of the Commission that the amendment recommended conforms with your policy concerning the development of atomic energy in cooperation with friendly foreign countries.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, on its own behalf and on behalf of the United Kingdom Atomic Energy Authority, desiring to amend in certain respects the agreement for cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "agreement for cooperation") signed between them in Washington on the 15th day of June 1955, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The following amendments shall be made to the agreement for cooperation concerning the exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

(1) Paragraph C (ii) of article I shall be amended to read as follows:

"(ii) Restricted data which is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged, except as provided in article I bis."

(2) Paragraph C (iii) of article shall be amended to read as follows:

"(iii) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package-power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military use, and there may be future types of reactors the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to any of these types of reactors will not be exchanged, except as provided in article I bis."

(3) The following new article shall be inserted after article I:

"ARTICLE I BIS

"Exchange of Information of Reactors of Primary Significance:

"A. At such time as any of the types of reactor referred to in article I-C (iii) war-

rants application to civil uses, restricted data on that type shall be exchanged as may be agreed, subject to the provisions of article I.

"B. In the meantime, and subject to the provision of article I, classified and unclassified information on the development, design, construction, operation, and use of military package-power reactors and reactors for the propulsion of naval vessels, aircraft, or land vehicles, for military purposes, shall be exchanged to the extent and by such means as may be agreed. Each party will use its best efforts to ensure that any classified information received from the other party pursuant to this paragraph will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use, until such time as it has been agreed under paragraph A of this article to exchange restricted data on the type of reactor to which such classified information pertains or such information has been removed from the category of classified information by the party from which it has been received."

(4) In paragraph A of article VII the words "in accordance with article II" shall be amended to read "in accordance with article I bis or article II".

ARTICLE 2

Article IV of the agreement for cooperation shall be amended by (1) adding the letter "A" before the present paragraph of that article and (2) adding the following new paragraph:

"B. In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in article II subject to the provisions of article I, specific arrangements may be agreed between the parties from time to time under which special nuclear material required for developmental purposes, including use in research and experimental reactors, may be exchanged for other materials under such terms and conditions as may be agreed."

ARTICLE 3

The following new article shall be inserted after article IX of the agreement for cooperation:

"ARTICLE IX BIS

"Responsibility for use of information, materials, equipment, and devices:

"The application or use of any information including design, drawings, and specifications, materials, equipment, or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE 4

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the agreement for cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such amendment.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington this 13th day of June 1956 in two original texts.

For the Government of the United States of America:

C. BURKE ELBRICK,
Deputy Assistant Secretary of
State for European Affairs.
LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, United States
Atomic Energy Commission.

For the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

ROGER MAKINS,
Ambassador of the United Kingdom of
Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

JUNE 26, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic
Energy, Congress of the United
States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. An executed amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America," signed on June 15, 1955;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the amendment;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the amendment, authorizing its execution and containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security.

Article 1 of this amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the agreement for cooperation, signed on June 15, 1955, will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 26, 1956.

The Honorable LEWIS L. STRAUSS,
Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 15, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States of America, which was signed on June 15, 1955.

The Commission's letter states that article 1 of the amendment is required at this time to permit the exchange of information, including restricted data, between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance, and that the Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

I have also noted that article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to information and

material exchanged under the terms of the agreement.

I have examined the proposed amendment to the agreement and I share in the belief of the Commission that the performance of the agreement will result in mutual benefit to both governments.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby

(1) Approve the proposed amendment to the Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy;

(2) Determine that the performance of the proposed amendment to the agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States; and

(3) Authorize the execution of the proposed amendment to the agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 15, 1956.

The President,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the attached amendment to the agreement entitled "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada," which was signed on June 15, 1955. It is also recommended that you authorize the execution of this proposed amendment by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Article 1 of the amendment will permit the exchange of information between the United States and Canada on reactors which are primarily of military significance. The amendment provides that the parties shall use their best efforts to insure that classified information exchanged on reactors of primarily military significance will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use until such time as the parties agree that the information may be exchanged for civilian purposes. This amendment has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State and is consistent with your expressed interest in the contemplated exchange of information. The Department of Defense has urged the negotiation of this amendment because of its importance to defense planning. Upon analysis of pertinent facts the Commission has found that naval, aircraft, land vehicle, and package power reactors exclusively employed for military use are not atomic weapons as defined by the Atomic Energy Act, and that the vessels, aircraft, and land vehicles which may utilize such reactors are not atomic weapons by virtue of such utilization; that the restricted data proposed to be communicated under the Amendment does not involve information relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons. Also, the Commission has concluded, from advice received from the Attorney General, that in light of the foregoing facts the exchange of restricted data such as that provided in this amendment is in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.

Article 3 of the amendment records the responsibilities of the parties with reference to the application or use of information and material exchanged pursuant to the agreement.

The Atomic Energy Commission believes that the execution of the enclosed amendment will be mutually advantageous to the United States and Canada and will not con-

stitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States. The guaranties undertaken by the parties in the existing agreement for cooperation will continue and will be applicable to the transactions contemplated by the enclosed amendment.

In view of the foregoing considerations, it is the opinion of the Commission that the amendment recommended conforms with your policy concerning the development of atomic energy in cooperation with friendly foreign countries.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

AMENDMENT TO AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION ON THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

The Government of the United States of America (including the United States Atomic Energy Commission) and the Government of Canada, desiring to amend in certain respects the agreement for cooperation on the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy (hereinafter referred to as the "Agreement for Cooperation") signed between them in Washington on the 15th day of June, 1955, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE 1

The following amendments shall be made to the agreement for cooperation concerning the exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

(1) In lieu of article II-A of the Agreement for Cooperation substitute the following:

"A. Limitations:

"(1) Of information which is classified, only that relevant to current or projected programs will be exchanged.

"(2) The parties to this agreement will not exchange restricted data relating to design or fabrication of atomic weapons or exchange restricted data which, in the opinion of either party, is primarily of military significance under this article II.

"(3) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military use, and there may be future types of reactors the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to any of these types of reactors will not be exchanged under this article II.

"(4) Within the subject matter of this agreement, the parties may come into possession of privately developed and privately owned information and information received from other Governments which the parties are not permitted to exchange.

"(5) It is mutually understood and agreed that except as limitations are stated to apply specifically to one party or the other, any limitations to cooperation imposed pursuant to this agreement shall be reciprocal."

(2) Article II-B is amended as follows:

1. In lieu of subparagraph (1), substitute the following:

"(1) Information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of research, production, experimental power, demonstration power, and power reactors, except as provided in paragraph A and subparagraph (2) of this paragraph."

(3) Subparagraph (2) of article II-B is hereby deleted.

(4) Amend subparagraph (3) of article II-B by deleting the number (3) and substituting therefor the number (2).

(5) The following new article shall be inserted after article II:

"ARTICLE II BIS

"Exchange of information on reactors of primarily military significance:

"A. At such time as any one of the types of reactors referred to in article II-A (3) warrants application to civil uses, restricted data on that type shall be exchanged as may be

agreed, subject to the other provisions of article II-A.

"B. In the meantime, and subject to the provisions of article II-A, classified and unclassified information on the development, design, construction, operation and use of military package power reactors and reactors for the propulsion of naval vessels, aircraft, or land vehicles, for military purposes, shall be exchanged to the extent and by such means as may be agreed. Each party will use its best efforts to insure that any classified information received from the other party pursuant to this paragraph will be used only in connection with reactors intended for military use, until such time as it has been agreed under article II bis A to exchange restricted data on the type of reactor to which such classified information pertains or such information has been removed from the category of classified information by the party from which it has been received."

ARTICLE 2

Article XIII is amended by deleting therefrom all references to article II-B (2).

ARTICLE 3

The following new article shall be inserted after article XIII of the agreement for cooperation:

"ARTICLE XIII BIS

"Responsibility for use of information, material, equipment, and devices:

"The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application."

ARTICLE 4

This amendment, which shall be regarded as an integral part of the agreement for cooperation, shall enter into force on the date on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement.

In witness whereof the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this amendment.

Done at Washington this _____.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of Canada:

JUNE 18, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,
Chairman, Joint Committee on
Atomic Energy,
Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement.

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security, and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

As you know, the Governments of the United States and the Commonwealth of Australia have since 1952 been cooperating in the production of uranium ores and concentrates, and this agreement, therefore, will represent an extension of the cooperation in atomic energy between the two countries.

The proposed agreement, when executed, will permit cooperation between Australia and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy, with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. The agreement will permit the exchange of classified and unclassified information, under appropriate security arrangements. Under the proposed agreement, the Commission would sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent for use as fuel in the operation of defined reactors constructed in Australia. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. You will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to non-peaceful purposes. Source of special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

In article IX of the agreement the parties agree that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates will continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,

Washington, June 18, 1956.

Adm. LEWIS L. STRAUSS,

Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. STRAUSS: Under date of June 16, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy and particularly to the development of atomic power; for the exchange of reactor materials not available commercially; for the transfer of equipment and devices; and for the continuation of the existing raw materials arrangements between the two countries. The agreement also provides for the exchange of information on the exploration for and treatment and production of source materials. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

It is provided in the proposed agreement that the Commission will sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for

appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and Australia in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of Section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 16, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed Agreement for Cooperation Between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America Concerning the Civil Uses of Atomic Energy and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

The proposed agreement has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and is, in the opinion of the Commission, an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Australia in accordance with the policy which you have established. The Government of the United States and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, since 1952, have been cooperating in the production of uranium ores and concentrates, and this agreement, therefore, represents an extension of cooperation in the atomic energy field between the United States and Australia.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of research reactors, and of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program, and technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the design, construction and operation of such reactors. In addition, classified information on the exploration for and treatment and production of source materials will be exchanged.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however,

that no material, equipment or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The proposed agreement would permit the United States to sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in Australia. The Commission may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for use as fuel in reactors constructed pursuant to the agreement will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Australia or while fuel elements are in transit. The U-235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U-235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article X of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VIII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects, related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XII the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established.

In article IX the parties agree that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for sale of uranium ores and concentrates to the agency will continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

Respectfully,

Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF AUSTRALIA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA CONCERNING THE CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

PREAMBLE

Whereas the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, through the Australian Atomic Energy Commission, and the Government of the United States of America, through the United States Atomic Energy Commission, are cooperating in the production of uranium ores; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, mindful of

the fact that atomic energy is capable of application for peaceful purposes which hold great promise for all mankind, desire to cooperate with each other in developing and furthering the beneficial uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia is now engaged in the development of facilities for the application of atomic energy for civil purposes: the parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force from time to time in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

1. Restricted data which are primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

2. Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

3. The exchange of restricted data shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

4. The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package-power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant peacetime application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the parties will not transfer or export, or permit the transfer or export, under this agreement, of any material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety con-

nected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information including restricted data:

1. Reactors:

(a) General information on design and characteristics of research reactors, and of experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program.

(b) Technological information as may be agreed, on specific research reactors, and on experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the design, development, construction and operation of such reactors, and when in the case of the Commonwealth of Australia such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Commonwealth of Australia or when such reactors are being seriously considered for construction by the Commonwealth of Australia as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power production program.

(c) Classified information within subparagraphs (a) and (b) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(1) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(2) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(3) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(4) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(5) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(6) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of these on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

2. Source materials:

Geology, exploration techniques, chemistry, and technology of extracting uranium and thorium from their ores and concentrates, the chemistry, production technology, and techniques of purification and fabrication of uranium and thorium compounds and metals, including design, construction, and operation of plants.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: In connection with any subject of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, materials of interest, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will, under this article, be exchanged in research quantities for research purposes and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the

extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor materials testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that neither party will be able to permit access by personnel of the other party to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or Australia may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other Government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other Government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to (1) the provisions of paragraph E of article II; (2) applicable laws, regulations and license requirements; (3) approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services required the communication of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II, may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or service to the party or person for whom such material or service is furnished:

1. The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III.

2. Technological information within the categories set forth in article III. B. 1. c. as is required for the design, construction, and operation of specific research reactors, and of experimental, power demonstration, or power reactors, and when in the case of the Commonwealth of Australia such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Commonwealth of Australia or when such reactors are being seriously considered for construction by the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction as a source of power or as an intermediate step in a power-production program.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U-235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia less the quantity of contained U-235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not

be enriched above 20 percent U-235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors (1) which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, after consultation with the United States Commission, decides to construct or (2) which are constructed by a person in Australia with the concurrence of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia after consultation with the United States Commission; and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials-testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or persons under its jurisdiction decide to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Australia or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in Australia, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may otherwise be agreed, that the form and content of the irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with material obtained from the United States which is in excess of Australia's need for such material in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the United States shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase such material at prices then prevailing in the United States for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the United States,

and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organization in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and under the limitations set forth in Article II and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials including heavy water and natural uranium but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

It is agreed that existing arrangements and contracts between the Combined Development Agency and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia for the sale of uranium ores and concentrates to said Agency shall continue in effect until their expiration as provided in these arrangements or contracts.

ARTICLE X

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application, or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries;

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and releases the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIV.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE XI

A. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices,

which warrant a classification in accordance with the classification criteria referred to in the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission shall be safeguarded in accordance with the security safeguards and standards prescribed in such security arrangements.

B. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

1. The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

2. In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia shall return to the United States Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

ARTICLE XIII

The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XII, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

1. With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the United States Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or any

other material designated by the United States Commission;

2. With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission, (ii) reactors, (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provision of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in insuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XIV;

3. To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in Australia and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

4. To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, shall have access in Australia to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

5. In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XIV and the failure of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article;

6. To consult with the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIV

A. The Government of the Commonwealth of Australia guarantees that:

1. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

2. No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

3. No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the United States and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

1. The security safeguards and standards prescribed by the applicable security arrangements between the United States Commission and the Australian Commission will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

2. No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XV

The application or use of any information (including design, drawings, and specifications), material, equipment or device, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XVI

For purposes of this agreement:

A. "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

B. "Australian Commission" means the Atomic Energy Commission of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America, including the Australian Commission on behalf of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above "parties."

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "Byproduct material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "Confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the Government of the United States, to any data, information, materials, services, or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, Government agency or Government corporation but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than an atomic weapon in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission to be source material or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

L. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of —, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

P. J. F. (June 16, 1956).

CLARK C. VOGEL (June 16, 1956).

USAEG.

For the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia:

PERCY SPENDER,
Ambassador for Australia to
United States of America.

Certified true copy of proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of the United States of America concerning the civil uses of atomic energy identified, as shown, by representatives of the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia and representatives of the Government of the United States of America.

JUNE 20, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy,

Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: Pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is submitted with this letter:

1. A proposed agreement for cooperation with the Government of Switzerland;

2. A letter from the Commission to the President recommending approval of the proposed agreement;

3. A letter from the President to the Commission approving the agreement, containing his determination that it will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security; and his authorization to execute the proposed agreement.

The proposed agreement, when executed, will permit cooperation between Switzerland and the United States in matters relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. The agreement will permit the exchange of classified and unclassified information, under

appropriate security arrangements. Under the proposed agreement the Commission would sell to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent for use as fuel in the operation of defined reactors constructed in Switzerland. The Commission may, in its discretion, make a portion of the 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. You will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement would be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. Source or special nuclear material received from the United States under the agreement would be reprocessed in the United States in Commission facilities or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Sincerely yours,

Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 20, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman,
Atomic Energy Commission,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 19, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of Switzerland and the Government of the United States of America.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

The proposed agreement provides that the Commission will sell to the Government of Switzerland for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and Switzerland in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States and the Government of Switzerland concerning the civil uses of atomic energy.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 20, 1956.

THE PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Switzerland," and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, will broaden the scope of cooperation between Switzerland and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation between the two countries on matters relating to the design, development, construction, and operation of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors. In the opinion of the Commission, the agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in Switzerland in accordance with the policy which you have established.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange, under appropriate security arrangements, of unclassified and classified information relating to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a power production program and for an exchange of technological information, as may be agreed, on specific experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required for the development, construction, and operation of such reactors.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however, that no material, equipment, or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell to the Government of Switzerland uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in Switzerland. The Commission at its discretion may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of Switzerland for use as fuel in

reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in Switzerland or while fuel elements are in transit.

The U-235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U-235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XI the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the event such an agency is established.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be executed by the appropriate authorities of Switzerland and the United States. In compliance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. This agreement with Switzerland, when executed, will supplement the cooperation undertaken by the two Governments in the agreement signed on July 18, 1955, which provided for cooperation in the field of research reactors and their use.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States have, on July 18, 1955, signed into an agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas such agreement provides that it is the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial agreement for cooperation will extend to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands has advised the Government of the United States of America of its desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy including the design, construction, and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America desires to cooperate with the Government of the Netherlands in such a program as hereinafter provided; and

Whereas the parties desire to supersede the agreement for cooperation signed on

July 18, 1955, for this agreement which includes the new areas of cooperation;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. The agreement for cooperation signed on July 18, 1955, is superseded in its entirety on the day this agreement enters into force.

B. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each Government shall receive from the other Government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations, and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Restricted data which in the opinion of the United States Commission is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(2) Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

(3) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(4) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors in the opinion of both parties warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the United States Commission will not transfer or permit the export, under this agreement, of any materials or equipment and devices if such materials or equipment and devices are, in the opinion of the United States Commission, primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences, and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information, including restricted data:

(1) General information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research or power production program.

(2) Technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors, and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the development, construction, and operation of specific reactors which the Netherlands intends to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

(3) Classified information within subparagraphs (1) and (2) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(a) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including the composition, shape, size and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(b) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator and coolant and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics and shielding.

(e) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of such on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with the subject of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provisions set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall quantities of special nuclear materials transferred under this article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor material testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood

that the United States Commission will not be able to permit access to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Netherlands may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Netherlands will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, to and perform services for the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) The provisions of paragraph E of article II;

(2) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) Approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communications of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III;

(2) Technological information within the categories of information set forth in article III B 3 on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the construction and operation of specific reactors which the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction intend to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U-235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Netherlands less the quantity of contained U-235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not be enriched above 20 percent U-235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the

operation of defined research, and experimental, demonstration power and power reactors which the Government of the Netherlands in consultation with the United States Commission decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in the Netherlands and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Netherlands or persons under its jurisdiction decides to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Netherlands will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in the Netherlands, the Government of the Netherlands will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of the Netherlands' need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase of such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organizations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects

of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, and under the limitations set forth in article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application, or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries.

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty, or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and release the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIII.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE X

A. The criteria of security classification established by the United States Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement. The United States Commission will keep the Government of the Netherlands informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this article, shall be safeguarded in accordance with applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America, repre-

sented by the United States Commission, and the Government of the Netherlands.

C. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement, shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

(1) The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards, including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

(2) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Netherlands shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Netherlands becomes a member of such an integrated group, and if an agreement for cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Netherlands to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Netherlands pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XI, by safeguards of the proposed international atomic energy agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards, to review the design of any (i) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safe-

guards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: Source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission.

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission, (ii) reactors, (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply, (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guarantees set forth in article XIII;

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in the Netherlands and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties;

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Netherlands, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Netherlands, shall have access in the Netherlands to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary;

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guarantees set forth in article XIII and the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article;

(6) To consult with the Government of the Netherlands in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Netherlands undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIII

A. The Government of the Netherlands guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of

the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Netherlands may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIV

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XV

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "The Netherlands" means the European part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

B. "Commission" or "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above parties.

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "Byproducts material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Netherlands or the Government of the United States of America, to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "restricted data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "Equipment or device" means any instrument,

apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than atomic weapon, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium, enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other materials which the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

L. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

M. "Atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of —, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America:

For the Government of the Netherlands:

JUNE 20, 1956.

The PRESIDENT,

The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The Atomic Energy Commission recommends that you approve the enclosed "Agreement for Cooperation Concerning Civil Uses of Atomic Energy Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands", and authorize its execution by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

This agreement, which has been negotiated by the Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, will incorporate and supersede the agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy which was entered into on July 18, 1955, between the two Governments. In particular, the proposed agreement will broaden the scope of cooperation between the Netherlands and the United States in fields related to the peaceful utilization of atomic energy by providing for cooperation between the two countries on matters relating to the development, construction and operation of experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors, as well as research reactors. In the opinion of the Commission, the agreement is an important and desirable step in advancing the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy in the Netherlands in accordance with the policy which you have established.

The proposed agreement calls for an exchange, under appropriate security arrangements, of unclassified and classified information relating to the development of the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In particular, article III provides for an exchange of general information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research and power production program and for an exchange of technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors.

The exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend to that which is relevant to current or projected programs, will not include any information which is primarily of military significance, and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. The proposed agreement also provides for an exchange of reactor materials not available commercially. The parties agree, however, that no material, equipment, or devices which are primarily of military significance will be transferred or exported under the agreement.

The agreement will permit the Commission to sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 enriched, except as noted below, up to a maximum of 20 percent during the period of the agreement for use as fuel in the operation of defined research, experimental, demonstration power, and power reactor projects in the Netherlands. The Commission at its discretion may make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred to the Government of the Netherlands for use as fuel in reactors will not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit.

The U-235 to be transferred under this agreement is being made available in accordance with your recent announcement that the United States is prepared to make up to 20,000 kilograms of U-235 available to friendly countries to facilitate the development of nuclear power for peaceful purposes, and you will note that article XII of the agreement incorporates provisions which are designed to minimize the possibility that material or equipment transferred under the agreement will be diverted to nonpeaceful purposes. In addition, article VII of the agreement provides that when any source or special nuclear material received from the United States requires reprocessing, such reprocessing will be performed by the Atomic Energy Commission in Commission facilities, or in facilities acceptable to the Commission.

Article IV of the agreement would permit the transfer of special nuclear materials, including U-235, U-233, and plutonium, for defined research projects related to the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In article XI the parties affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy and express their intention to reappraise the agreement in the

event such an agency is established. Article XI also recognizes the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic energy programs of a group of nations and accordingly, provides that such an integrated group may assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under the agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the United States, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

Following your approval and subject to the authorization requested, the agreement will be executed by the appropriate authorities of the Netherlands and the United States. In accordance with section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, the agreement will be placed before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Respectfully,

W. F. LIBBY, Acting Chairman.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 21, 1956.

Dr. W. F. LIBBY,

Acting Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR DR. LIBBY: Under date of June 20, 1956, the Atomic Energy Commission recommended that I approve a proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands.

I have examined the agreement recommended. It calls for an exchange of classified and unclassified information relating to the development of peaceful uses of atomic energy with particular emphasis on the development of nuclear power. It is provided, however, that the exchange of restricted data under the agreement will extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs; will not include any information which is primarily of military significance; and will not include information concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor. Further, no material, equipment, or device which is primarily of military significance will be exchanged under the agreement.

The proposed agreement provides that the Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands for use as fuel in defined reactors uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium enriched up to a maximum of 20 percent, except that a quantity of the uranium, enriched up to 90 percent, may be made available for use in a materials testing reactor. The agreement provides for appropriate safeguards against the diversion of materials and equipment for unauthorized uses.

The agreement also affirms the interest of the United States and the Netherlands in the establishment of an international atomic energy agency which would foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and I note that it takes into account the efforts that are now being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations.

Accordingly, pursuant to the provisions of section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and upon the recommendation of the Atomic Energy Commission, I hereby—

1. Approve the within proposed agreement for cooperation concerning the civil uses of atomic energy between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Netherlands.

2. Determine that the performance of the proposed agreement will promote and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to the common defense and security of the United States, and

3. Authorize the execution of the proposed agreement for the Government of the United States by appropriate authorities of the United States Atomic Energy Commission and the Department of State.

Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

JUNE 21, 1956.

Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON,

Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, Congress of the United States.

DEAR SENATOR ANDERSON: In connection with the proposed agreement for cooperation between the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States which the Atomic Energy Commission transmitted to you today pursuant to section 123c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, there is attached to this letter two copies of an agreement between the Commission and the Government of the Netherlands regarding the agreed security arrangements concerning information and materials, including equipment and devices, relating to civil uses of atomic energy to be exchanged under the agreement for cooperation. There is also attached a copy of the Commission's letter to the President forwarding the security arrangement.

These security arrangements are referred to in articles X and XIII of the proposed agreement for cooperation and establish the security principles and criteria which will apply in the implementation of that agreement.

Your attention is directed to the fact that the Government of the Netherlands has agreed to maintain a security program similar to that maintained by the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the protection of classified information and materials exchanged under the agreement for cooperation and that both Governments guarantee that all classified information and material exchanged under the agreement for cooperation will be safeguarded in accordance with the safeguards and standards established by the security arrangements. An examination of the Netherlands's security practices by the Commission's Division of Security has indicated that the security requirements of the agreement for cooperation can be adequately implemented.

Sincerely yours,

W. F. LIBBY,
Acting Chairman.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION CONCERNING CIVIL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY BETWEEN THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE GOVERNMENT OF THE NETHERLANDS

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States have on July 18, 1955, signed an agreement for cooperation concerning civil uses of atomic energy; and

Whereas such agreement provides that it is the hope and expectation of the parties that the initial agreement for cooperation will extend to consideration of further cooperation extending to the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the Netherlands has advised the Government of the United States of America of its desires to pursue a research and development program looking toward the realization of peaceful and humanitarian uses of atomic energy including the design, construction and operation of power-producing reactors; and

Whereas the Government of the United States of America desires to cooperate with the Government of the Netherlands in such a program as hereinafter provided; and

Whereas the parties desire to supersede the agreement for cooperation signed on

July 18, 1955, for this agreement which includes the new areas of cooperation;

The parties therefore agree as follows:

ARTICLE I

A. The agreement for cooperation signed on July 18, 1955, is superseded in its entirety on the day this agreement enters into force.

B. This agreement shall enter into force on the day on which each government shall receive from the other government written notification that it has complied with all statutory and constitutional requirements for the entry into force of such agreement and shall remain in force for a period of 10 years.

ARTICLE II

A. Subject to the provisions of this agreement, the availability of personnel and material, and the applicable laws, regulations and license requirements in force in their respective countries, the parties shall cooperate with each other in the achievement of the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

B. The disposition and utilization of atomic weapons and the exchange of restricted data relating to the design or fabrication of atomic weapons shall be outside the scope of this agreement.

C. The exchange of restricted data under this agreement shall be subject to the following limitations:

(1) Restricted data which in the opinion of the United States Commission is primarily of military significance shall not be exchanged.

(2) Restricted data concerning the production of special nuclear materials except that concerning the incidental production of special nuclear materials in a power reactor shall not be exchanged.

(3) It shall extend only to that which is relevant to current or projected programs.

(4) The development of submarine, ship, aircraft, and certain package power reactors is presently concerned primarily with their military uses. Accordingly, restricted data pertaining primarily to such reactors will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors in the opinion of both parties warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed. Information on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged. Likewise, restricted data pertaining primarily to any future reactor-types the development of which is concerned primarily with their military use will not be exchanged until such time as these types of reactors warrant civil application and the exchange of information on these types of reactors may be agreed; and restricted data on the adaptation of these types of reactors to military use will not be exchanged.

D. This agreement shall not require the exchange of any information which the parties are not permitted to communicate because the information is privately developed and privately owned or has been received from another government.

E. It is agreed that the United States Commission will not transfer or permit the export, under this agreement, of any materials or equipment and devices if such materials or equipment and devices are, in the opinion of the United States Commission, primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE III

A. Subject to the provisions of article II, classified information in the specific fields set out below and unclassified information shall be exchanged between the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to the application of atomic energy to peaceful uses, including research and development relating to such uses and problems of health and safety

connected therewith. The exchange of information provided for in this article shall be accomplished through the various means available, including reports, conferences and visits to facilities.

B. The parties agree to exchange the following classified information, including restricted data:

(1) General information on the design and characteristics of research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors as is required to permit an evaluation and comparison of their potential use in a research or power production program.

(2) Technological information, as may be agreed, on specific research, experimental, demonstration power, or power reactors and, when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the development, construction, and operation of specific reactors which the Netherlands intends to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power, or power program in the Netherlands.

(3) Classified information within subparagraphs (1) and (2) hereof shall be exchanged within the following fields:

(a) Specifications for reactor materials: Final form specifications including the composition, shape, size, and special handling techniques of reactor materials including uranium, heavy water, reactor grade graphite, and zirconium.

(b) Properties of reactor materials: Physical, chemical, metallurgical, nuclear, and mechanical properties of reactor materials including fuel, moderator, and coolant, and the effects of the reactor's operating conditions on the properties of these materials.

(c) Reactor components: The design and performance specifications of reactor components, but not including the methods of production and fabrication.

(d) Reactor physics technology: This area includes theory of and pertinent data relating to neutron bombardment reactions, neutron cross sections, criticality calculations, reactor kinetics, and shielding.

(e) Reactor engineering technology: This area includes considerations pertinent to the overall design and optimization of the reactor and theory of and data relating to such problems as reactor stress and heat transfer analysis.

(f) Environmental safety considerations: This area includes considerations relating to normal reactor radiations and possible accidental hazards and the effect of such on equipment and personnel and appropriate methods of waste disposal and decontamination.

ARTICLE IV

A. Research materials: Materials of interest in connection with the subject of agreed exchanges of information as provided in article III and under the provision set forth in article II, including source materials, special nuclear materials, byproduct material, other radioisotopes, and stable isotopes will be exchanged for research purposes in such quantities and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed when such materials are not available commercially. In no case, however, shall quantities of special nuclear materials transferred under this article and within the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands be, at any one time, in excess of 100 grams of contained U-235, 10 grams of plutonium, and 10 grams of U-233.

B. Research facilities: Subject to the provisions of article II and under such terms and conditions as may be agreed, and to the extent as may be agreed, specialized research facilities and reactor material testing facilities of the parties shall be made available for mutual use consistent with the limits of space, facilities, and personnel conveniently

available, when such facilities are not commercially available. It is understood that the United States Commission will not be able to permit access to facilities which are primarily of military significance.

ARTICLE V

With respect to the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III and subject to the provisions of article II, equipment and devices may be transferred from one party to the other under such terms and conditions as may be agreed. It is recognized that such transfer will be subject to limitations which may arise from shortages of supplies or other circumstances existing at the time.

ARTICLE VI

A. It is contemplated that, as provided in this article, private individuals and private organizations in either the United States or the Netherlands may deal directly with private individuals and private organizations in the other country. Accordingly, in the fields referred to in paragraph B of this article, persons under the jurisdiction of either the Government of the United States or the Government of the Netherlands will be permitted to make arrangements to transfer and export materials, including equipment and devices, and to perform services for the other government and such persons under its jurisdiction as are authorized by the other government to receive and possess such materials and utilize such services, provided that any classified information shall fall within the fields specified in paragraph B and subject to:

(1) The provisions of paragraph E of article II;

(2) Applicable laws, regulations and license requirements;

(3) Approval of the party to the jurisdiction of which the person making the arrangement is subject if the materials or services are classified or if the furnishing of such materials or services requires the communications of classified information.

B. To the extent necessary in carrying out the arrangements made under paragraph A of this article, classified information in the following fields, subject in each case to the provisions of article II may be communicated by the person furnishing the material or services to the party or person to whom such material or service is furnished:

(1) The subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III;

(2) Technological information within the categories of information set forth in article III B. 3 on specific research, experimental, demonstration power or power reactors and when in the case of the Netherlands, such information is required in connection with reactors currently in operation in the Netherlands or when such information is required in the construction and operation of specific reactors which the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction intend to construct as part of a current research, experimental, demonstration power or power program in the Netherlands.

ARTICLE VII

A. During the period of this agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of the Netherlands uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 in a net amount not to exceed 500 kilograms of contained U-235 in uranium. This net amount shall be the quantity of contained U-235 in uranium sold to the Government of the Netherlands less the quantity of contained U-235 in recoverable uranium resold to the United States or transferred to any other nation or international organization with the approval of the United States in accordance with this agreement. This material may not be enriched above 20 percent U-235 except as hereinafter provided. Such material will be sold

subject to the terms and conditions of this article and the other provisions of this agreement as and when required as initial and replacement fuel in the operation of defined research, and experimental, demonstration power, and power reactors which the Government of the Netherlands in consultation with the United States Commission decides to construct or authorize private organizations to construct in the Netherlands and as required in experiments related thereto. The United States Commission may, upon request and in its discretion, make a portion of the foregoing 500 kilograms available as material enriched up to 90 percent for use in a materials testing reactor, capable of operating with a fuel load not to exceed 6 kilograms contained in U-235 in uranium.

B. The quantity of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 transferred by the United States Commission under this article and in custody of the Government of the Netherlands shall not at any time be in excess of the amount of material necessary for the full loading of each defined reactor project which the Government of the Netherlands or persons under its jurisdiction decides to construct as provided herein, plus such additional quantity as, in the opinion of the United States Commission, is necessary to permit the efficient and continuous operation of the reactor or reactors while replaced fuel elements are radioactively cooling in the Netherlands or while fuel elements are in transit, it being the intent of the United States Commission to make possible the maximum usefulness of the material so transferred.

C. Each sale of uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 shall be subject to the agreement of the parties as to the schedule of deliveries, the form of material to be delivered, charges therefor and the amount of material to be delivered consistent with the quantity limitations established in paragraph B. It is understood and agreed that although the Government of the Netherlands will distribute uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 to authorized users in the Netherlands, the Government of the Netherlands will retain title to any uranium enriched in the isotope U-235 which is purchased from the United States Commission at least until such time as private users in the United States are permitted to acquire title in the United States to uranium enriched in the isotope U-235.

D. It is agreed that when any source or special nuclear materials received from the United States of America require reprocessing, such reprocessing shall be performed at the discretion of the United States Commission in either United States Commission facilities or facilities acceptable to the United States Commission, on terms and conditions to be later agreed; and it is understood, except as may be otherwise agreed, that the form and content of any irradiated fuel elements shall not be altered after their removal from the reactor and prior to delivery to the United States Commission or the facilities acceptable to the United States Commission for reprocessing.

E. With respect to any special nuclear material produced in reactors fueled with materials obtained from the United States which are in excess of the Netherlands' need for such materials in its program for the peaceful uses of atomic energy, the Government of the United States of America shall have and is hereby granted (a) a first option to purchase of such material at prices then prevailing in the United States of America for special nuclear material produced in reactors which are fueled pursuant to the terms of an agreement for cooperation with the Government of the United States of America, and (b) the right to approve the transfer of such material to any other nation or international organizations in the event the option to purchase is not exercised.

ARTICLE VIII

As may be necessary and as may be mutually agreed in connection with the subjects of agreed exchange of information as provided in article III, and under the limitations set forth in article II, and under such terms and conditions as may be mutually agreed, specific arrangements may be made from time to time between the parties for lease, or sale and purchase, of quantities of materials, including heavy water and natural uranium, but not including special nuclear materials, greater than those required for research, when such materials are not available commercially.

ARTICLE IX

A. With respect to any invention or discovery employing information classified when communicated in accordance with article III and made or conceived as a result of such communication during the period of this agreement, the Government of the United States of America with respect to invention or discovery rights owned by it, and the Government of the Netherlands with respect to any invention or discovery owned by it or made or conceived by persons under its jurisdiction:

(1) Agree to transfer and assign or cause to be transferred or assigned to the other all right, title, and interest in and to any such invention, discovery, patent application or patent in the country of that other, subject to a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for the governmental purposes of the transferring party and for purposes of mutual defense;

(2) Shall, upon request of the other, grant or cause to be granted to the other a royalty-free, nonexclusive, irrevocable license for its governmental purposes in the country of the transferring party or third countries, including use in the production of materials in such countries for sale to the requesting party by a contractor of such party;

(3) Agree that each party may otherwise deal with any invention, discovery, patent application or patent in its own country or third countries as it may desire, but in no event shall either party discriminate against citizens of the country of the other in respect of granting any license under the patents owned by it in its own or third countries.

(4) Waive any and all claims against the other for compensation, royalty or award as respects any such invention or discovery, patent application or patent and release the other with respect to any such claim.

B. (1) No patent application with respect to any classified invention or discovery employing information which has been communicated under this agreement may be filed by either party or any person in the country of the other party except in accordance with agreed conditions and procedures.

(2) No patent application with respect to any such classified invention or discovery may be filed in any country not a party to this agreement except as may be agreed and subject to article XIII.

(3) Appropriate secrecy or prohibition orders shall be issued for the purpose of giving effect to this paragraph.

ARTICLE X

A. The criteria of security classification established by the United States Commission shall be applicable to all information and material, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement. The United States Commission will keep the Government of the Netherlands informed concerning these criteria and any modifications thereof, and the parties will consult with each other from time to time concerning the practical application of these criteria.

B. It is agreed that all information and material, including equipment and devices, which warrant a classification in accordance with paragraph A of this article shall be

safeguarded in accordance with applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America, by the United States Commission, and the Government of the Netherlands.

C. It is agreed that the recipient party of any material, including equipment and devices, and of any classified information under this agreement shall not further disseminate such information or transfer such material, including equipment and devices, to any other country without the written consent of the originating country. It is further agreed that neither party to this agreement will transfer to any other country equipment or device, the transfer of which would involve the disclosure of any classified information received from the other party, without the written consent of such other party.

ARTICLE XI

A. The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America affirm their common interest in the establishment of an international atomic-energy agency to foster the peaceful uses of atomic energy. In the event such an international agency is created:

(1) The parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects, if any, they desire to modify the provisions of this agreement for cooperation. In particular, the parties will consult with each other to determine in what respects and to what extent they desire to arrange for the administration by the international agency of those conditions, controls, and safeguards including those relating to health and safety standards, required by the international agency in connection with similar assistance rendered to a cooperating nation under the aegis of the international agency.

(2) In the event the parties do not reach a mutually satisfactory agreement following the consultation provided in paragraph A of this article, either party may by notification terminate this agreement. In the event this agreement is so terminated, the Government of the Netherlands shall return to the Commission all source and special nuclear materials received pursuant to this agreement and in its possession or in the possession of persons under its jurisdiction.

B. It is recognized that efforts are being made in Western Europe to integrate the atomic-energy programs of a group of nations. If the Government of the Netherlands becomes a member of such an integrated group and if an agreement for cooperation on atomic energy is made between the group of nations and the Government of the United States of America, the latter would be prepared if so requested by the Government of the Netherlands to arrange for the integrated group to assume the rights and obligations of the Government of the Netherlands under this agreement, provided the integrated group can, in the judgment of the Government of the United States of America, effectively and securely carry out the undertakings of this agreement.

ARTICLE XII

The Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States emphasize their common interest in assuring that any material, equipment, or device made available to the Government of the Netherlands pursuant to this agreement shall be used solely for civil purposes.

A. Except to the extent that the safeguards provided for in this agreement are supplanted, by agreement of the parties as provided in article XI, by safeguards of the proposed International Atomic Energy Agency, the Government of the United States of America, notwithstanding any other provisions of this agreement, shall have the following rights:

(1) With the objective of assuring design and operation for civil purposes and permitting effective application of safeguards,

to review the design of any (1) reactor and (ii) other equipment and devices the design of which the Commission determines to be relevant to the effective application of safeguards, which are to be made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction, or which are to use, fabricate, or process any of the following materials so made available: source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission.

(2) With respect to any source or special nuclear material made available to the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction by the Government of the United States of America or any person under its jurisdiction and any source or special nuclear material utilized in, recovered from, or produced as a result of the use of any of the following materials, equipment, or devices so made available: (i) source material, special nuclear material, moderator material, or other material designated by the United States Commission; (ii) reactors; (iii) any other equipment or device designated by the United States Commission as an item to be made available on the condition that the provisions of this subparagraph A2 will apply: (a) to require the maintenance and production of operating records and to request and receive reports for the purpose of assisting in ensuring accountability for such materials; and (b) to require that any such material in the custody of the Government of the Netherlands or any person under its jurisdiction be subject to all of the safeguards provided for in this article and the guaranties set forth in article XIII.

(3) To require the deposit in storage facilities designated by the United States Commission of any of the special nuclear material referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article which is not currently utilized for civil purposes in the Netherlands and which is not purchased pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (a) of this agreement, transferred pursuant to article VII, paragraph E (b) of this agreement, or otherwise disposed of pursuant to an arrangement mutually acceptable to the parties.

(4) To designate, after consultation with the Government of the Netherlands, personnel who, accompanied, if either party so requests, by personnel designated by the Government of the Netherlands, shall have access in the Netherlands to all places and data necessary to account for the source and special nuclear materials which are subject to subparagraph A2 of this article to determine whether there is compliance with this agreement and to make such independent measurements as may be deemed necessary.

(5) In the event of noncompliance with the provisions of this article or the guaranties set forth in article XIII and the failure of the Government of the Netherlands to carry out the provisions of this article within a reasonable time, to suspend or terminate this agreement and require the return of any materials, equipment, and devices referred to in subparagraph A2 of this article.

(6) To consult with the Government of the Netherlands in the matter of health and safety.

B. The Government of the Netherlands undertakes to facilitate the application of the safeguards provided for in this article.

ARTICLE XIII

A. The Government of the Netherlands guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with re-

spect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction by purchase or otherwise pursuant to this agreement will be used for atomic weapons, or for research on or development of atomic weapons, or for any other military purpose.

(3) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the Netherlands or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the Netherlands, except as the United States Commission may agree to such a transfer to another nation, and then only if the transfer of the material or restricted data is within the scope of an agreement for cooperation between the Government of the United States of America and the other nation.

B. The Government of the United States of America guarantees that:

(1) The security safeguards and standards prescribed by applicable security arrangements between the Government of the United States of America by the United States Commission and the Government of the Netherlands will be maintained with respect to all classified information and materials, including equipment and devices, exchanged under this agreement.

(2) No material, including equipment and devices, or any restricted data transferred to the Government of the United States of America or authorized persons under its jurisdiction pursuant to this agreement, will be transferred to unauthorized persons or beyond the jurisdiction of the Government of the United States of America, except as the Government of the Netherlands may agree to such a transfer to another nation.

ARTICLE XIV

The application or use of any information (including design drawings and specifications), material, equipment, or devices, exchanged or transferred between the parties under this agreement shall be the responsibility of the party receiving it, and the other party does not warrant the accuracy and completeness of such information and does not warrant the suitability of such information, material, equipment, or device for any particular use or application.

ARTICLE XV

For the purposes of this agreement:

A. "The Netherlands" means the European part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

B. "Commission" or "United States Commission" means the United States Atomic Energy Commission.

C. "Parties" means the Government of the Netherlands and the Government of the United States of America, including the United States Commission on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. "Party" means one of the above parties.

D. "Atomic weapon" means any device utilizing atomic energy, exclusive of the means for transporting or propelling the device (where such means is a separable and divisible part of the device), the principal purpose of which is for use as, or for development of, a weapon, a weapon prototype, or a weapon test device.

E. "By-product material" means any radioactive material (except special nuclear material) yielded in or made radioactive by exposure to the radiation incident to the process of producing or utilizing special nuclear material.

F. "Classified" means a security designation of "confidential" or higher applied, under the laws and regulations of either the Government of the Netherlands or the Government of the United States of America,

to any data, information, materials, services or any other matter, and includes "Restricted Data."

G. "Equipment and devices" and "Equipment or device" means any instrument, apparatus, or facility and includes any facility, except an atomic weapon, capable of making use of or producing special nuclear material, and component parts thereof.

H. "Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, firm, association, trust, estate, public or private institution, group, government agency or government corporation, but does not include the parties to this agreement.

I. "Reactor" means an apparatus, other than atomic weapons, in which a self-supporting fission chain reaction is maintained by utilizing uranium, plutonium, or thorium, or any combination of uranium, plutonium, or thorium.

J. "Restricted data" means all data concerning (1) design, manufacture, or utilization of atomic weapons; (2) the production of special nuclear material; or (3) the use of special nuclear material in the production of energy, but shall not include data declassified or removed from the category of restricted data by the appropriate authority.

K. "Special nuclear material" means (1) plutonium, uranium, enriched in the isotope 233 or in the isotope 235, and any other material which the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission determines to be special nuclear material; or (2) any material artificially enriched by any of the foregoing.

L. "Source material" means (1) uranium, thorium, or any other material which is determined by the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission to be source material; or (2) ores containing one or more of the foregoing materials, in such concentration as the Government of the Netherlands or the United States Commission may determine from time to time.

M. "Atomic energy" means all forms of energy released in the course of nuclear fission or nuclear transformation.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have caused this agreement to be executed pursuant to duly constituted authority.

Done at Washington in duplicate this — day of —, 1956.

For the Government of the United States of America: _____

For the Government of the Netherlands: _____

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate now adjourn until Monday next at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, July 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29, 1956:

SUPREME COURT, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Masaji Marumoto of Hawaii to be associate justice of the Supreme Court, Territory of Hawaii, for a term of 4 years vice Philip L. Rice, elevated.

MUNICIPAL COURT, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The following-named persons to be associate judges of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, Domestic Relations Branch, for terms of 10 years to fill new positions:

John H. Burnett, of the District of Columbia.

Godfrey L. Munter, of the District of Columbia.
 Frank Hammett Myers, of the District of Columbia.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29, 1956:

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Frederick G. Hamley, of Washington, to be United States circuit judge for the ninth circuit.

FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY BOARD OF REVIEW

Edwin R. Price, of Maryland, to be a member of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review, term expiring July 15, 1959.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

Howard H. Shannon, of New Jersey, to be Assistant Director of Locomotive Inspection.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following candidates for appointment in the regular corps of the Public Health Service, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law and regulation, in the grade indicated:

To be senior surgeons

Herbert A. Hudgins
 Stanley J. Sarnoff

To be senior dental surgeon

Seymour J. Kreshover

To be senior sanitarian

Robert Johnston

To be senior assistant nurse officers

Dorothy L. Connors
 Margaret M. Sweeney

The following candidates for permanent promotion in the Regular Corps of the Public Health Service subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law and regulations, in the grade indicated:

To be medical directors

Russell O. Settle	Albert L. Chapman
Waldron M. Sennott	James K. Shafer
Curtis G. Southard	Louis Jacobs
Hugh B. Cottrell	Carl L. Larson
Dorland J. Davis	Max M. Van Sandt

To be senior surgeon

Eli M. Lippman

To be surgeons

William J. Zukel	William H. Sage III
Carl F. Essig, Jr.	Charles A. Jarvis
Simon P. Abrahams	Charles H. Lithgow
Virgil B. Polley	John M. Bishop, Jr.
Jarvis E. Seegmiller	Robert H. Aronstam
John S. Shuttleworth	James W. Osberg, Jr.
DeArmond Moore	Robert L. Brutsche
Richmond T. Prehn	James R. Lewis
Harry S. Wise	Carl F. Mattern
Paul M. Duffy	Clifford H. Cole
John V. Osborne	Harvey A. Itano
John H. Waite	Daniel J. Tenenberg
Thomas J. Kennedy, Jr.	C. F. Sparger
Victor E. Archer	Ernest Cotlove
Charles J. Buhrow	Douglas H. Crockett
Ernest G. Hanowell	

To be senior assistant surgeons

Allen C. Pirkle	John R. Moran
John F. Lee, Jr.	James D. Tovey
Jack Durell	John W. Giotfelty
Don E. Leuzinger	William K. Carlile

To be dental director

Herbert A. Spencer

To be dental surgeons

Alfred Popper	Quentin M. Smith
John W. Heck	Reuben L. Turner

To be senior assistant dental surgeons

L. Charles Larsen	George J. Yocum
Charles H. Davis	Leonard R. Iverson
George E. Garrington	

To be sanitary engineer director
 Glen J. Hopkins

To be senior sanitary engineers

Frederick K. Erickson	Joseph H. Coffey
Paul C. Henderson	Frederick Aldridge
Ernest P. Dubuque	E. Carl Warkentin
Harry Stierli	John H. Ludwig
John R. Thoman	Harvey F. Ludwig
Frank A. Butrico	Harry W. Poston
Bernard B. Berger	Donald J. Schliessmann
Louis F. Warrick	James H. Crawford
Ray Raneri	Samuel R. Welbel
O. John Schmidt	Curtis E. Richey
Kenneth C. Lauster	Gerald Dyksterhouse
Joseph A. Boyer	
Ross W. Buck	

To be sanitary engineers

William B. Page
 Ernest C. Tsivoglou

To be senior assistant sanitary engineer

Jerrold M. Michael

To be senior pharmacists

Ernest J. Simmacher
 Carmen A. Carrato
 Boyd W. Stephenson

To be pharmacists

Milton W. Skolaut
 Frank E. Dondero
 Allen J. Brands

To be senior assistant pharmacists

Albert B. Ripley	Joseph N. Salvino
Mario C. Baratta	Bertram J. Baughman

To be scientist director

John T. Tripp

To be senior scientists

Francis M. Middleton
 Richard P. Dow
 Simon Kinsman

To be senior assistant scientist

Virgil R. Carlson

To be senior sanitarian

Daniel E. O'Keefe

To be sanitarians

Charles E. Gerhardt
 Samuel M. Rogers

To be senior veterinarian

Robert D. Courter

To be nurse director

Florence H. Callahan

To be senior nurse officers

Elizabeth H. Boeker	Gladys C. Guydes
Marjorie W. Spaulding	M. Lois Power
Catherine M. Sullivan	M. Dolores Jones
Margaret E. Willhoit	Anne H. MacNeill

To be nurse officers

Genevieve T. Plette	Faye G. Abdellah
Florence J. Ullman	Elizabeth J. Haglund
Elizabeth Kuhlman	

To be senior dietitian

Engla J. Anderson

To be dietitian

Susanne C. Van Leuzen

We pray that we may daily assemble here, not primarily to argue and maneuver for the victory of our personal opinions but to yield ourselves to Thy divine guidance and to seek to know the mind of God.

Grant that, before we legislate and make any decision during these dark and troublous days, this Chamber may be for each of us a listening place where we shall catch the inspiration of Thy spirit.

Make us more eager to hear and heed Thy voice revealing Thy will and showing us how best we may discharge all our tasks and responsibilities.

To Thy name we ascribe all the praise. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the Reserve components who are involuntarily released from active service.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 9893. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to inquire of the majority leader as to the program today and what he has outlined.

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall be very happy to advise the gentleman and I am glad my friend asked this question.

The first order of business today is the conference report on the Defense Department appropriation bill. Thereafter there will be a continuation of general debate on the school construction bill. We hope general debate will be completed this afternoon and the first section read. Beyond that we will not go today.

I will announce the program for next week later. There will be a continuation of this bill, and it is very important that all Members be here Monday—at least

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 29, 1956

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.
 The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou eternal spirit, unto whom all hearts are open and all desires known, may we now be numbered among the seekers and finders of God.

I make that statement as an expression of my own opinion.

The school construction bill will come up, of course, after the other business is disposed of and it will be read under the 5-minute rule.

There may be other matters of import also.

Mr. MARTIN. There is no likelihood of the present bill being considered beyond reading of the first section today?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. The gentleman probably is going to ask me about tomorrow. I may say we are not going to meet tomorrow. That is understood by all the parties interested in the bill. I have taken the matter up with everyone interested.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Adair	Fino	Rees, Kans.
Anfuso	Fulton	Richards
Ayres	Gamble	Roosevelt
Barrett	Garmatz	Rutherford
Bass, Tenn.	Green, Pa.	Sadlak
Baumhart	Halleck	Saylor
Beamer	Harden	Scott
Belcher, Okla.	Harvey	Scudder
Bell	Hull	Sheehan
Bray	James	Shelley
Brooks, Tex.	Kilburn	Sieminski
Brownson	King, Pa.	Springer
Canfield	Kirwan	Staggers
Celler	Lane	Thompson, La.
Chase	Lesinski	Thompson, Tex.
Chatham	McCulloch	Thornberry
Christopher	McDowell	Tumulty
Coudert	Meador	Van Pelt
Crumpacker	Miller, Md.	Velde
Cunningham	Minshall	Vursell
Curtis, Mo.	Morano	Wainwright
Davidson	Morrison	Wickersham
Davis, Tenn.	O'Hara, Minn.	Wigglesworth
Davis, Wis.	Patman	Wilson, Ind.
Donovan	Powell	Zelenko
Dorn, S. C.	Prouty	
Eberhart	Reece, Tenn.	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 343 Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN CONSTRUCTION AT MILITARY INSTALLATIONS

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9893) to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other pur-

poses, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. VINSON, Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ARENDS.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have until midnight Saturday to file certain reports on certain bills, together with any minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 11811

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may have until midnight Saturday to file a report on the bill H. R. 11811.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

MINORITY REPORT ON H. R. 8902

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed until midnight tonight to file a minority report on the bill H. R. 8902.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON H. R. 11861

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight to file committee reports on the bill H. R. 11861, the soil erosion bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, world renowned statesman, composer, and pianist. As most of us know, he died in New York City on June 29, 1941, at the age of 80.

Poland, America, the free world followed his body to its temporary resting place in Arlington Cemetery with the grief suitable to our mourning for one whose spirit had come to symbolize all that we hold dear. Poland, then, as now, was the symbol of the unconquerable soul of a nation, suffering under foreign rule and conquest, victim for years and

centuries of political and religious oppression; and Paderewski, musician of fire and fervor, famous at once for technical mastery and for emotional appeal, stood before the world as the symbol of Poland.

He became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919, after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson. In his brief political career of a few years, after the close of World War I, he earned the undying love of his native land and the admiration of the world by his magnificent performance in bringing together warring factions in Poland, and speaking for Poland in the conferences to establish postwar boundaries with a persuasiveness and fairness that brought the world as far on the road toward peace as one man's voice and force could bring it. It has been said that, had his counsels been fully accepted, World War II might have been prevented.

When Poland lost her independence again, at the start of the Second World War, he refused to play concerts in public.

Paderewski's body lies in Arlington, in the custody of our Nation. His heart is preserved in a crypt in Cypress Hills Abbey, in Brooklyn, N. Y., in the custody of the heirs of Paderewski's friend, my good and long-time friend, the late member of the Assembly of the State of New York, John Smolenski.

May God speed the day when this body, that worked for the glory of Poland, and this heart, that beat with a fierce passion for freedom, may be reunited in that free Poland for which we Americans hold them as a sacred trust. I pray that yesterday's uprising against Communist oppression in Poznan may be the beginning of that day.

POLES STRIKE FOR LIBERTY

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the news of yesterday's rioting in Poznan against the Communist oppressors of the Polish Nation electrified the entire free world, and demonstrated once again that the Polish people will continue to resist the Communist rule with every ounce of their strength.

According to news dispatches, thousands of Polish workers clashed yesterday with tanks and troops, shouting for bread and demanding that the Russians leave Poland.

This was the biggest anti-Communist demonstration in the Communist-dominated part of the world since the June 17, 1953, uprising in East Germany, when some 200,000 workers revolted against the Red rule.

The uprising in Poznan shows that the spirit of people who prize liberty and independence cannot be suppressed or killed. Without arms—with bare hands

and stones—the people will rise and resist the oppressor. They have done it before, and they will do it again until they are free.

This most recent momentous event in Poznan should make us pause and think—think hard—about what is happening in the captive nations, and within the entire sphere of Communist domination.

There is trouble behind the Iron Curtain—serious trouble. The Soviet military program has apparently taxed the resources of captive nations, and of the Soviet Union itself, to the utmost. It has forced the Communists to plan a reduction of their armies, and a transfer of this manpower to industrial undertakings, intended to improve the standard of living of the peoples that they dominate. It has forced the ruling clique to change their tactics.

It is very apparent that the present leaders of the Soviet Union find it increasingly difficult to maintain their oppressive rule. The events of the past 2 years show that they are searching for new methods of keeping the satellite and captive nations in line, and of simultaneously advancing their long-range plans for the extension of their rule over other nations.

I do not believe that the long-range objectives of the Communists have changed. The fact remains, however, that the difficulties which they are presently encountering are—in a sense—forcing them into a corner. They can try to get out of it by relaxing their rule, and by trying to improve the living conditions behind the Iron Curtain. Or—and this is a possibility we must not ignore—they can try to do something drastic.

For this reason, the free world must remain alert, and we must be prepared to meet any eventuality.

Together with other Members of this House, and with free men all over the world, I want to pay tribute today to the brave people of Poznan, whose courage and determination serve as an inspiration to all of us.

The struggle for liberty continues, and it will not stop until Poland—and the other captive peoples—are once again free. The people of Poznan and of other areas of Poland have shown that they are determined to win that struggle. It is our task to spare no effort in the endeavors to bring about the victory of liberty, and the establishment of lasting and just peace in the world.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1957—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement on the part of the managers be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. No. 2529)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) "making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 5, 7, 8, 13, 16, 17, and 18.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 6, 9, and 11, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$55,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$320,162,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$357,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$1,140,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$3,724,185,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$41,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 14.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

DENNIS CHAVEZ,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
LISTER HILL,
HARRY F. BYRD,
LEVERETT SALTONSTALL,
STYLETS BRIDGES,
MILTON R. YOUNG,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Title III

Department of the Army

Amendment No. 1—Maintenance and operations: Appropriates \$2,967,057,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$2,954,581,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2—Military Construction, Army Reserve Forces: Appropriates \$55,000,000 instead of \$40,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$60,000,000 as proposed by the Senate. Of the \$15,000,000 increase over the House bill, \$12,000,000 is for National Guard armory and \$3,000,000 for National Guard non-armory construction. The managers are agreed that construction of duplicate reserve facilities must be avoided, except in areas where absolutely required as determined by the Office of the Secretary of Defense.

Amendment No. 3—Army National Guard: Appropriates \$320,162,000 instead of \$306,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$321,492,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers are agreed that of the increase of \$14,162,000 over the amount contained in the bill as passed the House, \$11,162,000 is to cover costs resulting from the anticipated increase in the strength of the Guard, and \$3,000,000 for salaries of additional technicians and equalization of technicians pay grade structure. The managers are further agreed that this appropriation, in an amount not exceeding \$330,000, may be used for the travel of National Guard teams to national rifle matches, provided that no regular activity is in any way reduced.

Amendment No. 4—National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice: Appropriates \$357,000 instead of \$297,000 as proposed by the House and \$534,000 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of \$60,000 over the amount provided by the House is for the purchase of .22-caliber ammunition.

Amendment No. 5—Reduction in Appropriation, Army Industrial Fund: Restores language proposed by the House and stricken by the Senate reducing the amount available in the Army industrial fund by \$110,000,000.

Title IV

Department of the Navy

Amendment No. 6—Service-wide operations: Appropriates \$102,435,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$102,472,000 as proposed by the House. The managers are agreed that if the three sets of flag officers quarters are authorized by the Congress and constructed at the Naval Observatory they shall be furnished and maintained with funds available under this appropriation item at a cost of not to exceed \$37,000.

Amendment No. 7—Naval Petroleum Reserves: Appropriates \$683,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$1,183,000 as proposed by the Senate. The managers are agreed that this appropriation shall be available for the costs of maintenance and protective guard services of the Government's oil-shale plant at Rifle, Colo., pending disposition of this facility by the responsible Federal agencies.

Amendment No. 8—Reductions in Appropriations: Reduces the Navy Industrial Fund by \$52,000,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$12,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Title V

Department of the Air Force

Amendment No. 9—Aircraft and related procurement: Appropriates \$6,848,500,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$6,048,500,000 as proposed by the House. The committee of conference is agreed that the added funds should be utilized to expedite production of heavy bombers, tankers, and other essential Air Force weapons to the optimum limit of existing facilities. The Managers on the part of the House place the Department on notice that the action taken in approving the additional funds above the Budget for Aircraft and Related Procurement should not be interpreted as an invitation toward waste and loose fiscal procedures and calls attention to a report on procurement policies released by the House Committee on Appropriations earlier this year.

Amendment No. 10—Procurement other than aircraft: Appropriates \$1,140,000,000 instead of \$1,100,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$1,177,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 11—Research and development: Appropriates \$710,000,000 as proposed by the Senate instead of \$610,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 12—Operation and maintenance: Appropriates \$3,724,185,000 instead of \$3,684,185,000 as proposed by the House and \$3,780,185,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13—Military personnel: Appropriates \$3,718,440,000 as proposed by the House instead of \$3,745,440,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14—Military personnel: Reported in disagreement.

Title VI

General Provisions

Amendment No. 15: Limits the availability of funds for preparation for sale or salvage of military materiel to \$41,000,000, instead of \$31,000,000 as proposed by the House and \$53,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 16: Deletes provision of the Senate for the transfer of \$40,000,000 from the Navy industrial fund and \$110,000,000 from the Army industrial fund to the Air Force industrial fund.

Amendment No. 17: Deletes provision of the Senate making appropriations for procurement of aircraft and missiles available for expenses of development. The committee of conference does not intend that the deletion of this provision alter the existing procedures in the application of these funds.

Amendment No. 18: Changes section number.

GEORGE MAHON,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT L. F. SIKES,
W. F. NORRELL,
JAMIE L. WHITTEN,
GEORGE ANDREWS,
JOHN J. RILEY,
CHARLES B. DEANE,
DANIEL J. FLOOD,
CLARENCE CANNON,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
ERRETT P. SCRIVNER,
GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
EDWARD T. MILLER,
HAROLD C. OSTERTAG,
GLENN R. DAVIS,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 25 minutes. In a word, the conference report provides for an appropriation for the Department of Defense for the coming fiscal year the sum of \$34,656,727,000. This sum is approximately \$1 billion more than the bill carried when it passed the House on May 10. It is \$127 million less than the sum included in the

bill as it passed the Senate. The details of the measure have been outlined in the statement which was read to the House a few moments ago, and I would like to discuss the situation from an overall policy standpoint.

Mr. Speaker, the House, the Senate, and the executive branch of the Government have been wrestling all year with the question: Is the present defense budget adequate?

There is room for differences of opinion, honest differences of opinion on this subject. After World War I we quickly demobilized and had only a token military force. After World War II we rapidly demobilized and we soon had an inadequate military force. At the end of the Korean hostilities our Nation recognized the menacing threat of Soviet Russia and did not make the mistake we made after World War I and World War II.

We have been proceeding on a spending basis for the Army, Navy, and Air Force of around \$35 billion per year, which is no small sum to be raised from the taxpayers of our country. I think every American would like to have a stronger national defense than we have.

The civilian leaders and the top military people in the Department of Defense have repeatedly told Congress this: We would like to have more in some fields, but we think, generally speaking, the funds requested by the President are fairly and reasonably adequate for this year. But the people in the Pentagon pointed out earlier in the year, and they pointed out more recently, that next year the level of spending will have to be considerably above the level for this year and the level of appropriations for next year will have to be a few billions above the appropriations for this year.

When the bill was under consideration in the House earlier in the year, in the debate on that bill I made the following statement:

Our position of military supremacy is in jeopardy, and what we do within the next 2 to 5 years will determine whether or not we are to be definitely surpassed in overall military striking power by the U. S. S. R.

It is perfectly evident that that decision has to be made; it cannot be postponed beyond next year. Members in the other body wanted to make part of that decision this year and they have made it.

Admiral Radford, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, agrees, I think, that it may be that eventualities will arise which will require additional funds during the fiscal year about to begin.

Secretary Quarles has told both branches of Congress, I believe, that in the program for intercontinental ballistic missiles he can foresee the possible requirement for additional funds in the coming fiscal year, funds above the current budget.

He said, Mr. Speaker:

I do not feel like asking for the money until we can pinpoint the reasons and purposes for which the money will be spent.

It has been evident to me that there is a very strong probability that during the coming fiscal year a supplemental

request, in addition to the current presidential budget, will be sent to Congress.

There have been hearings on both sides of the Capitol at which military people have been asked, without taking into account fiscal considerations, "How much money would you like to have?" There seems to be an assumption that when you think about national defense you should not consider economic, fiscal or budgetary matters. I violently disagree with that opinion. National defense, to be effective, must take into consideration the economic structure, the taxpayer and the survival of our way of life while we seek to maintain peace.

Mr. Speaker, asking a military man how much defense he would like to have is like asking how deep is the ocean, how high is the sky? Asking a military man how much money he would like to have is like asking a farmer or a rancher how much land he would like to have. He will say, "Oh, not much; just all the land that adjoins me." Asking a photographer if he wants another picture will always bring the reply, "Just one more." With the Department of Defense it is just one more billion dollars.

I am not speaking critically. We should ask our military men to brush aside budgetary considerations and to tell us what they would like to have. I go along with that because their opinion is most important. But if you ask each service how much money it would like to have, budgetary considerations omitted, you can run up an annual budget for defense of 50 or 75 billion dollars a year. If defense could be achieved without sacrifice and without price we would be moving ahead with a much more expanded program than we now have.

To ask General LeMay how many long-range B-52 heavy bombers he would like to have is important. He has indicated perhaps 2,000. Up to now we have only provided something over 500. Up to date with the funds provided in the pending bill that runs to about \$6 billion. You can take \$16 billion and get the 2,000 bombers eventually, but if we had 2,000 of the B-52 bombers I am confident that there would be talk about the bomber being obsolescent and the need for hundreds of more modern bombers for the Air Force. We are already making plans of the successor to the B-52. It is not possible, in view of the financial requirements, the heavy cost of manpower, to have everything we would like to have in defense and still survive economically. The people want adequate defense and they want it desperately. They feel there are limits beyond which it should not be necessary for them to go. I do not think they want to work all around the clock every day of the year for defense. They feel that their leadership in the White House and in the Congress ought to be wiser than that, and I agree with them.

The other body asked the Air Force what it would do with an additional billion dollars above the President's budget. That was a good question. A representative of General Twining came to see me yesterday and gave me information as to what the Air Force would like to do

with an additional billion dollars, in the event such sum should be provided.

Well, in that request the Air Force said—and the Air Force is not the only judge, but perhaps the best judge as to its requirements—that for aircraft and related procurement, if it has \$1 billion more, it would like to have \$200 million for aircraft. The other body gave the Air Force \$800 million for B-52's and other aircraft and stood pat on that figure. So, we are giving the Air Force \$600 million more than the official advocate within the Air Force has asked for aircraft procurement.

Now, in the field of military construction, the Air Force said that with \$1 billion it would like to have \$400 million, in additional funds for construction of bases. If you could snap your fingers and get 2,000 B-52's, unless you had the bases, and trained men, unless you were ready for them, they would not do you much good for a long time. We have to have an integrated program. So, the military department said it would like to have \$400 million additional for construction of bases, but there is not a dime in the figures of the other body which are carried in this conference report for additional construction above the President's budget.

Now, when asked what they wanted for research and development, if they were to have \$1 billion handed to them above the President's budget, Air Force officials said they would like to have \$200 million. The bill before you gives them \$100 million.

That is the situation with which we are confronted. I would like to talk a little more about the B-52 program. The program is lagging. The House and the Senate and the American people, in my opinion, would like to see the program expedited. Within a certain number of months we are supposed to be producing 20 per month. We are not getting as many B-52's as we would like to have. But, in the regular budget we have provided vast sums of money in order to get these planes. Now, to launch a crash program and try to build additional plants for production of these planes—we have two plants producing them—would take a long time. The Department of Defense does not want to build additional plants, and I doubt that the Congress wants to do it. By increasing production to 100 a month you would have 2,400 in 2 years. Now these planes are expensive; as you know the B-52's cost about \$8 million each. We are not in the defense business for this year or next year only; we are in it for probably from now on out, and what the Department of Defense wants to do—and there is logic in it—is to proceed on a graduated basis, phasing in the new things and phasing out the old without too much cost to the taxpayers. Of course, we must all agree that the process must not be too slow.

Legislation is a matter of compromise. I doubt that the additional funds in the bill will cost the taxpayers any additional money in the long run. It will provide additional funds if there is any breakthrough in the Intercontinental Ballistic Missile Program, because this is where the money will come from. It

does provide that if a more rapid program of production of the B-52 can be worked out on a reasonable basis, the funds will be available. Funds will also be available for tanker aircraft, for fighter planes and related procurement.

This is an election year. There are political overtones in many of the things we do in election year. This is not unwholesome. The defense issue has been made and it is not an improper issue, I felt this way, that we should not appropriate any of the additional funds or we should appropriate substantially all the additional funds and make the issue clear-cut before the Congress and the country.

Had I written the bill myself, I would not have written it as it was written by the other body. But the other body, having agreed on the additional \$800 million for the aircraft procurement program and members of the other body having taken an unyielding position on the issue, I did not desire to take the responsibility of seeking, perhaps over long days of controversy, to eliminate that figure, particularly since I think some of it is necessary. If it is not used, since it is a no-year appropriation, it will be there to be used next year, because we are going to have to have the funds next year if we do not provide them this year. So there are two sides to this issue and I do not minimize the position of those who feel that we should have the sum or those who feel that the additional appropriation could be deferred until next year.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. I might call attention to the fact that since the bill passed the House, there has been a great deal more information developed; and that in the other body, even the administration members were advocating a \$500 million increase above the amount carried in the bill as it passed the House. So that in the House and the Senate there has been a change and the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is absolutely consistent, is not inconsistent with the speech he made when the bill was in the House before.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for his helpful statement.

To place this whole matter more nearly in proper focus, I should like to make this observation. If we approve this bill in the Congress today the Air Force will have, for procurement of aircraft next week \$18 billion—\$18.8 billion. That is not a small or niggardly sum. All of those funds but about \$10 billion or \$11 billion will have already been committed on orders previously entered into. But there will be \$10 billion or \$11 billion of uncommitted funds available next week to the Air Force to enter into new contracts for planes, and related items of equipment.

What the other body really did was to increase the overall fund for aircraft procurement in the Air Force by less than 5 percent. It was not a gigantic increase percentagewise. That is the

difference between the two bodies and between the two bills basically.

Production of the B-52 can be increased to about 45 a month if we spend money tooling up plants which Boeing of Seattle and Wichita now have, and expanding those plants. The plants have the space, but they do not have the tools. Under this program we give the Administration the option of spending an estimated \$90 million for these additional tools and stepping up the production of the B-52 to 45 a month, which could be a matter of great urgency before the Congress reconvenes next year.

Mr. Speaker, I see the able gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] on the floor, and I think that he will agree, as I believe he was the one who developed the testimony in his subcommittee, that Boeing by additional tooling and putting the plants on three full shifts can achieve greater production. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I will say to the gentleman from Texas that he is correct in the statement that he has just made, that production can be stepped up by putting a complete third shift on. However, I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that as of last Friday the committee which I have the privilege to head which has investigated the aircraft industry was in the Boeing plant at Wichita, Kans., and we inspected the plant.

The Boeing officials told us they did not need additional money at this time to the extent of a billion dollars because they could not produce an additional aircraft. They could use the sum of \$100 or \$150 million in order to tool up to the projected future, which the gentleman developed a while ago, but as to the complete amount of money, this high figure, the Boeing people themselves say they do not need it because they cannot use it at this time.

Mr. MAHON. I think the gentleman is correct. Boeing already has contracts totaling more than \$2 billion for undelivered aircraft. The B-52 may be the finest plane we have ever produced, but it has a lot of imperfections, as all planes do at an early stage. Far more of these planes are being produced per month than are actually being delivered. Some months the company produces 5 or 6 and they have not delivered 1, because they have not been able to sufficiently correct defects for us to accept them.

We have been talking about better procurement proceedings. We have been talking about and urging the Department to get the plane developed to a fairly workable degree before contracting to buy it in quantity. It is sensible, if we can afford the time, to buy these planes more slowly in the beginning and phase up to higher production later on in order that we get more for our money.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to say to my very good and able friend from Texas that I accompanied the gentleman from Louisiana, Chairman HÉBERT, last Thursday and we went through the Boeing plant and discussed these matters with the

executive of that corporation. The facts are that we have got the cart before the horse until such time in the aviation industry as the plants are expanded, the machine tools and equipment are obtained, and the engineering and technical skills are recruited. If you gave them \$5 billion they could not produce any more planes. That is the conclusion I reached. So I cannot see where the conferees would agree to this additional billion dollars when it will not, at least in my thinking, produce any more planes because we do not have the manpower, the equipment, and the plants to build the planes. Until such time as the aviation business and industry is expanded to meet the increased demands, no matter how much you appropriate you will not get any more production.

Mr. MAHON. There is some merit, of course, in what the gentleman says, but if we are going to have sharply increased production 1 year or 2 years from now it is necessary to make the start considerably in advance.

I should like to some extent to deemphasize the B-52 aspect of this controversy. While the other body provided these funds mainly for the B-52, these funds are available for the ICBM, the intercontinental ballistic missile, as I said, and they are available for jet tankers, and there is no doubt but that additional funds are needed for the tanker program. They are also available for fighter planes. The figure as approved by the House was, I feel, a rather close figure. The Air Force was canceling out a number of contracts, recouping certain funds, and it recovered a lot of money that way last year. But the experience during the fiscal year 1956 thus far has shown that it is not doing as well in recouping funds as had been expected. So some of these funds may be required for the regular budgeted items. Those who trust the Defense Department, and I think all of us have some faith in the Defense Department, have a right to feel that these funds will be judiciously used and will not be wasted in extravagant procurement procedures.

That is just about the story as I see it. It was a question of whether to give the Department of Defense a greater degree of discretion in the use of funds by making available what was considered a more abundant amount. Within the next 2 to 5 years, if we do not speed up our production, and if we do not increase our defenses, we are going to be second best to the U. S. S. R. in several vital defense fields. I said earlier this year that this question can be postponed until next January. I say it again. But even though that philosophy has not prevailed I do not think we can quarrel too much with the action we are taking today. I admit there is some degree of doubt, but as I previously pointed out, that portion of funds which cannot be advantageously used this year will be carried into the succeeding fiscal year at which time, as is generally agreed, substantial additional funds will be required.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. GAVIN. I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that when the amendment was offered here in the House to add \$1 billion to the appropriation, the House evidenced its position and thinking on the matter. There was a standing vote on the amendment and there were less than 10 who stood in favor of the amendment. If I am correct, I think there were exactly four—is that right, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER]? That evidences the thinking of the House and why the conferees would immediately accept the \$1 billion after the House had expressed its will on the matter, I cannot understand.

Mr. MAHON. I think we have to agree there is some compromise in legislation. I think the gentleman should understand that what the House voted on is not the issue that was before the conferees. The House voted on a billion dollars additional for the B-52's. In this bill, we have \$800 million, and that is not tied to the B-52's only. Priority would be given to the B-52's, but it is easily possible, and it is my personal belief that a larger portion of the added sum will be spent for other defense weapons and for urgent requirements that may very well develop during the fiscal year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas is his usual genial and frank self this morning. In a lighter vein he put his finger on the primary situation here, namely, politics. There is an old Chinese proverb that might be translated to fit into the present position as far as the Republican conferees were concerned which would be translated presently this way: "Realism calls for recognition of defeat when defeat is inevitable." Quite frankly, the Republican House conferees were outnumbered 10 to 7 and it is just that simple. We were and we are now outnumbered. Yet, in view of the House action on the original bill, as presented to you so ably by the gentleman from Texas just a few short days ago, when the House, as was pointed out by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, overwhelmingly defeated an amendment to add \$1 billion, and especially in view of some of the remarks the gentleman from Texas has made today about what the Air Force would do with \$1 billion, and especially in view of what the gentleman from Texas said on the floor of the House during debate, it was really a little difficult to understand why the gentleman from Texas and his Democrat conferees did not take a different attitude and adamantly oppose the position taken by the Senate and hold out indefinitely until—well, at least until the 4th of July—against the proposed Senate action of adding \$800 million. But, before recalling some of the words he spoke here on the floor, and they were good words, they were convincing words, they were convincing to the House and they were convincing to me—I was in total agreement with them—let me point out that Secretary Quarles whom the gentleman from Texas and others have described as an outstanding Secretary of

the Air Force and a most capable man and public servant, stated less than 3 days ago that the 1957 Air Force budget, as provided by the House of Representatives, was adequate and ample. Secretary Quarles said we were solidly sufficient to prevent war by discouraging potential aggressors, and our 1957 program was designed to keep it that way.

Secretary Quarles further stated that strategic capabilities of the United States will still be superior to any other country, according to the best information of the intentions of other countries. In that statement he was referring to the 1957 budget without the additional \$800 million.

It should be pointed out and stressed a little more strongly than the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] stressed it, that this additional \$800 million is not earmarked for B-52's. The news stories after the action by the other body have indicated that this additional sum was to be all for B-52's. It is not. If you read the conference report, you will see where the conferees say that these added funds shall be used to expedite production of heavy bombers, fighters, tankers, and other air weapons. That includes missiles and a multitude of things necessary for our defense. The conferees, in their report, say that the Air Force shall do that with the existing facilities. General Twining told us quite frankly that the rate of production of the B-52, starting out is low, but the Wichita Boeing plant has now produced its first one. Therefore, there will now be two sources of production, and the number produced will go up and up and up. General Twining told us the proposed production schedule would give us the number of B-52's which we could assimilate into the Air Force in an orderly manner. You have to have bases, trained ground crews, ground-handling equipment, trained crews, training devices, and everything else that goes along with it with a new program. You cannot just put these bombers out there and leave them on the runways. That would do no good. As General Twining pointed out again, this is not a game of numbers. It is not the number of heavy bombers that we have as opposed to the Russians. That should not enter necessarily into it, because you do not fight bombers with bombers. When you realize that one bomber today can carry more death and destruction than was carried in all the raids by all the bombers in all of World War II, sometimes you may well wonder whether we need as many bombers as some folks claim we do.

We have air supremacy, retaliatory supremacy right now. We will continue to have it. Do not make any mistake about it. Either that, or General LeMay has made some false statements and we have wasted billions and billions of dollars.

The conference report speaks for itself. I told you I wanted to mention some of the things the gentleman from Texas said, but I agree with him that if you look at this in the light of reason and without getting too much upset—we may not agree with what was done, but we need not be upset about it—what Congress is doing is prefinancing some program that will be undertaken

a year from now. However, the other body chose to give additional funds to the Air Force now. Probably a billion dollars less will be required next year. So that even though the added money is not wanted by the Department of Defense and has not been asked for by the Air Force, it will not be wasted. We feel sure that if it is not needed for B-52's or fighters or tankers or missiles, it will not be unwisely spent. To unwisely spend it would be going in the face of the admonition of the conferees, because this money is not given to them to spend willy-nilly. They have to spend it wisely. If they cannot, they are not to spend it.

But let us review a little history, going back to May 10, 1956, turning to page 7964 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

We were then discussing a proposed amendment for a billion dollars; and the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], was talking. He said:

You will not at this time improve the defense posture of the United States in my judgment by appropriating an additional \$1 billion for B-52's.

He was just exactly right; it would not, and this \$800 million will not now. If you are going to talk about B-52's, it will not give you a single B-52 any sooner unless, contrary to the conferees' report, we do open a further source.

Then Mr. MAHON told you, and it is still true, that as of July 1, the Department of Defense will have \$69 billion unexpended. Then he asks you this question and you heeded it:

Why make this gesture of fiscal irresponsibility and provide an additional \$1 billion when the funds could not be properly used at this time?

I agreed with him then, and I agree with him in that query now, for that reason I could not quite understand the attitude he took in conference.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I am quite interested in the gentleman's comments, as usual, because he usually speaks to the point so far as his opinion pertains to the point, but I do not think the gentleman is fully justified in leaving the impression with the membership that this is a particular move on the Democratic side. As I recall it, the gentleman himself offered a compromise figure of \$500 million.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Yes, but it was not adopted; and I am realistic about these things.

Mr. SHEPPARD. If it was right in one instance it must have been right in the other, because a compromise is a compromise.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I could make a remark there which I ought not to make, and will not.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I might further call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the 83d Congress the gentleman was not at all reluctant to cast his own votes with his party which was then in the majority.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I did not hear the gentleman's reference to something I had done in the 83d Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would be very happy to have the Clerk read it back.

Mr. SCRIVNER. I have always voted for adequate defense—and as I recall it, that is what I voted for in the 83d Congress. Once again, I have been in this game a long time, although not as long as the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Massachusetts who referred to the \$500 million. When you cannot get a whole loaf of coal, sometimes you are glad to take just half a loaf; when you cannot get a whole loaf of bread you try to get half a loaf. We tried to be realistic both as to facts, figures, and the existing conditions on the \$800 million, and, as I say, the compromise proposal to cut the increase from \$800 million down to \$500 million was voted down 10 to 7, and that was the end of the conference, period.

Now, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out that without this \$800 million, the Air Force would have \$10,500,000,000 available to spend for aircraft and related items this coming year. And then he went on further and pointed out what I mentioned a moment ago, that it was not just a matter of the number of planes we had, B-52's or any others; he said we would not have the men to man them, the mechanics and technicians to maintain them, and that more is involved than just planes. I agreed with him then, and I agree with that observation now. He said:

What we need is more technicians, more trained personnel, and more experience.

This additional money will not provide the very things that the gentleman from Texas said would be necessary. That is, the trained personnel.

Then Mr. MAHON went on to say that we have provided \$5¼ billion for B-52's. He said, and this apparently he still believes:

So it seems to me that the increase in funds is unwise.

I agreed with that then, I agree with that now, that the increase is not needed at this time.

So I could go on commenting on his remarks. Then he made this final plea which the House heeded so overwhelmingly that fewer than 10 voted for the \$1 billion amendment, and with which I agreed then, and agree now:

So, let us go along in an orderly way and next year let us decide whether or not we need additional billions for B-52's.

The amendment was defeated overwhelmingly and the bill passed 377 to 0.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think we have known all along that next year more B-52's will be required.

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not only B-52's, but we told the House here during the debate that Secretary Quarles and General Twining along with others had said there would be more money needed next year than this year, but they said that this is adequate for 1957.

Mr. MAHON. And when the time comes along there will be more funds needed for other planes.

Mr. SCRIVNER. That is correct, missiles, too. The minute we bring a new plane off the drawing board, it is already on its way to be succeeded by a still faster, a still better, a longer range plane and, of course, a still more costly plane. There are always more coming along. If any emergency arises we want to have our Air Force equipped with not a lot of old, obsolete planes, but with as many of the latest and best planes as we can reasonably provide. That is the program that has been followed in the last 3 years. It has been carried out in a very fine way under President Eisenhower as Commander in Chief. That is the reason the Nation has been secure and at peace during the last 3 years even though it has been at a terrific price in taxpayers' dollars. The cost of that defense program is the premium that we are paying for our security, but, I believe, as heavy as the tax burden is for defense it is worth what we are paying at the present time. We are, and for the last 3 years have been, at peace—thanks to a good strong national defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER].

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT OF 1936

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

In connection with consideration of the appropriation bill for the Defense Department, and for our defense, one of the most important that we have, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 20th anniversary of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago today, after a long and sometimes bitter battle, the magna carta of American water transportation—the Merchant Marine Act of 1936—was enacted into law.

When the small but dark cloud of Hitler's rise to power in Europe was recognized by only a few, President Roosevelt directed the Congress to spare no reasonable effort in the restoration of the American merchant marine to a level commensurate with our international responsibilities, and adequate to transport our domestic waterborne commerce and a substantial portion of our waterborne foreign commerce.

It is inspirational to me to look back over the past two dynamic decades of growth and power of our great country in a violently changing world. In 1935, after over 15 years of effort to establish a privately owned merchant marine—with almost every conceivable form of aid—but the Federal Government was by far the largest operator of ships in the American merchant marine. American ships were carrying less than 35 percent of our overseas commerce. Many of them were obsolete, and most of them had an economic life of 5 years or less to go. Only two seagoing vessels—small by today's standards—were under construction in the shipyards of the Nation. The ship-repair segment of the industry was comparably impoverished.

Twenty years ago there were those who remembered the lesson of World War I, when most of our Nation denied the possibility of a World War II. The committees of the House and Senate worked arduously and continuously for over 18 months to find a formula for an adequate merchant marine. Seven or eight legislative proposals were introduced and exhaustively examined before the final resulting compromise became the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. In committee, and in floor debate, the battle was between the forces who favored Government ownership and operation and those who—while recognizing the necessity for Government aid because of the higher standards of American living—fought for the maximum degree of private ownership and operation. Above all, the sense of both Houses and both sides of the controversy was for the absolute need for a strong merchant marine.

It is now history that the enactment of the 1936 act produced the nucleus of ships in being and shipbuilding capacity that made possible the transportation miracle of World War II. Our shipbuilding effort, which produced over 5,000 merchant ships in the 4 war years, has never been equaled in the history of the world.

But, Mr. Speaker, without the farsighted executive and congressional impetus which produced the 1936 act, the margin of victory might not have been ours. It will be remembered that the late Otis S. Bland, of Virginia, was the father of this act.

Some have said that the 1936 act has not proved effective—that the modernization and increased stability in our merchant marine has been due solely to the abnormal conditions prevailing throughout the world in September 1939—the outbreak of war in Europe—until the end of the Korean war. I cannot agree.

Today we are realizing the fruits of the program called for in the 1936 act. In this program was the development of the excellent, high-speed, modern and safe sea-type cargo and combination vessel designed to serve the dual purpose of commerce and defense. Many of these fine ships were actually in being long before we got into World War II. Their construction effected the revitalization of our shipbuilding capacity. The operators who acquired them under the carefully developed requirements of the 1936 act set about the improvement of their services on the previously determined essential trade routes. The fast, regular, and frequent services required under the law are now paying dividends to American exporters and importers, and to the areas which they serve.

Within the past 2 years the lines which entered into contracts under the 1936 act are embarking upon a replacement of more than 180 new ships, to be built between 1955 and 1970, at an estimated total cost in excess of \$1,500,000,000.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another side to this picture which is perhaps even more urgent now than it was 20 years ago.

Today our international trade is expanding and our world obligations are increasing, but I regret to say that our participation in the foreign commerce of the United States is less than 25 per-

cent—lower than it was before the birth of the 1936 act.

There are many reasons for this which I will not attempt to discuss now. One thing, however, is clear, and that is that the principle is the same—the need is as great or greater—and it is our obligation to meet the challenge to keep our merchant marine on an even keel with the ever expanding growth of our foreign commerce and the growing needs of our national security.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House that Schuyler Otis Bland, of Virginia, a most distinguished Member of the House and chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee for 16 years, was the father of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which has proven so essential to the development and expansion of our waterborne commerce and our national defense.

I would like to insert at this point an editorial from today's New York Journal of Commerce:

MERCHANT MARINE ACT ANNIVERSARY

(By Edward P. Tastrom)

Today marks the 20th anniversary of the enactment by Congress of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, a piece of legislation that has come to be regarded as the Magna Carta of the shipping industry.

This law is particularly noteworthy for having set for the first time a long-range formula for the development of our overseas commercial shipping. It did this by establishing the parity formula for both construction and operation, required the lines which proposed to benefit by this arrangement to build up and earmark for new construction certain reserves, and to confine their operating activities to certain specific trade routes which were designed to promote the commerce of the United States.

It recognized the need of an adequate merchant fleet, but it also made certain that its development would be along the lines which would most adequately serve the common good both in time of crisis and in development of trade.

How has the act worked? A look at some statistics shows that the lines holding subsidy contracts have virtually doubled the size of their fleets. Today this fleet consists of 294 vessels of 3.2 million tons deadweight, compared with the prewar fleet of 171 ships aggregating 1.7 million tons.

More striking is the three-fold increase in yearly carrying capacity of this fleet due to the creation of larger and faster ships. Today, estimated cargo capacity lift is placed at more than 14 million tons deadweight, compared with 4.6 million 20 years earlier.

Capital reserves of these lines also have been built up to high levels and are estimated to aggregate about \$500 million. This has permitted several of the contract lines to announce new long-range construction plans recently ranging from \$175 million to over \$300 million.

Thus, this legislation can be said to have achieved its purpose and, according to the Committee of American Steamship Lines which represents the subsidized group, at a modest cost to the taxpayer. The committee estimates that the net operating subsidy cost from 1947 through 1954 (payments were discontinued during the war period) totaled \$68.3 million, or an average of \$8.5 million a year. This is after Federal income taxes and repayments under subsidy contracts as called for by law.

The 1936 act has been amended several times to meet changing economic and political conditions so that it continues today as the living instrument of our national maritime policy.

Looking into the future it is evident that still further changes will be in order over the years ahead if this law is to continue as a dynamic force.

New problems are constantly arising and new trends having a vital influence on business continue to come to light. Shipping, with its heavy capital investment, is a long-range planning proposition so that, while the securing of cargo is always an immediate concern, the steamship executive, like the master on the bridge of one of his ships, must always look to the horizon.

If one were to peer into the crystal ball today and try to divine what might be in store for us during the next 20 years it is possible to engage in some intriguing speculation, assuming of course, that we are spared the third world war.

Some interesting trends are developing and they all will affect shipping and our maritime policy.

There is, for example, the utilization of atomic power by the merchant marine. This is coming without question, and on a commercially practical scale. The submarine *Nautilus* can be likened to the *Clermont* which first successfully and profitably utilized steam propulsion. During the decade following that initial 1807 trip to Albany, tremendous strides were made and we have never stopped expanding in this direction as the performance of the superliner *United States*, demonstrates. Look for the same thing to happen with atomic power.

With this will come new problems in ship design, cost, and handling; the need for new types of safeguards afloat and in port; revisions in cost and capital accounting, to mention a few possibilities.

We shall continue to import more and more of our raw materials to feed the giant industrial machine that we call these United States. It may be necessary to insure this flow of products by extending the benefits of our maritime laws to specific types of bulk carriers.

We are engaged in what promises to be a great struggle with the Communist bloc for adoption by the backward countries of Africa, the Middle East, and the Orient of our basic philosophy as opposed to that of the Reds. Its origins must be in economic aid to lift living standards and prove visually that our way of emerging from the dark ages is the more preferable.

This struggle is just beginning, if we read correctly the new change in Russian attitude to one of apparent friendliness.

Actually, the new Moscow attitude is more dangerous than the old truculence because it is more insidious and may lull us into a false sense of security.

Again the steamship industry is in the position of playing a major role. Our flag penetrates every major port of the world and with it brings a segment of our national attitude and way of life. It can be utilized forcefully and effectively in this great struggle which is shaping up for the loyalty of key areas of the world.

We are fortunate in having a strong merchant fleet today. We must be ever alert to keep it strong and to expand it with the needs of our economy and our position as the world's leading trading nation.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dawson].

AN ACT TO SIMPLIFY ACCOUNTING, FACILITATE THE PAYMENT OF OBLIGATIONS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. DAWSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 9593) to simplify accounting, facilitate the payment of obligations, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and

agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. DAWSON of Illinois, JONES of Alabama, KILGORE, BROWN of Ohio, and JONAS.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, only a very short time ago we did pass through the Congress an appropriation bill for the Department of National Defense which did not include this extra \$900 million. At that time and prior to that time I made a special effort to not air my differences during the hearings with other members of the committee, realizing that this is only the second year I have been back on the subcommittee. I have the highest regard for all of the members, and all of them work very hard. If you were on that committee, you know they have to. But, I think there is only one justification at all for this increase which we have gone along with with the Senate in this conference report. I expressed myself very strongly that I personally could not vote for the increase unless it was adequately covered in the report. The report was prepared. I was not given a chance to go over it. It in no way reflects what I thought was agreed on at the time I agreed to vote for this increase, and I want to point out why I felt that way and do now.

Last year, after proving numerous instances of faulty policy, we got an investigation of the National Defense Department's procurement policies and practices, and it is an eye opener. I am sure most of you have not had time to read it, but I wish you would get a copy from the Appropriations Committee. The investigation had to do with the overall procurement policies and practices. It shows that one parachute company was awarded a contract based on political pressure. Another example was excluding royalties and license fees giving extra profits totaling \$5 million to North American alone. The Ford Motor Co. made a profit of 29.6 percent before it made voluntary returns to the Government. Contracts have been permitted to run for as long as 5 years without definitive specifications. Six thousand dollars more per engine paid to Buick than was necessary to others.

The things go on and on, and I point out some examples appearing on pages 162-163 of our committee hearings on defense appropriations released this spring:

DEFICIENCIES IN PROCUREMENT PRACTICES

Mr. WHITTEN. I would like to go further and what I am trying to get into is whether the Department of Defense is not a directive-issuing addition to or an appendage to the military services.

Based on these documents which I have listed and others, I would like to point out some things which happened in this record. I am not going into too much detail, Mr. Chairman, but on page 99 the statement (p. 57 of this hearing) is made:

"The failure of the procurement status report to contain timely entries of shipment from the manufacturer results in AMA's submitting ASI's and expedites on

material that has already been shipped by the manufacturer."

Then, we turn to page 101 (p. 58 of this hearing), and find the following:

"For example, in the Army too frequently, invitations for bids are issued containing items described by manufacturers' part number only. In other bids the part being procured is specified as a part manufactured by X company, or equal."

"The invitation for bid under such circumstances is often silent with respect to the existence or availability of drawings."

That could only lead to higher price bids and would tend to leave the business to one particular company.

I would like to list a number of these because I am of the opinion that it will save a little time if I do it this way.

We turn to page 103 (p. 59 of this hearing), and find the following:

"For example, one Army technical service justified an expenditure of \$130,000 in excess of the low bid on an end item on the basis that the cost involved in establishing a parts inventory of the low bidder's parts, together with the cost of preparing spare parts and operational manuals for the same, would exceed the apparent saving of \$130,000. Obviously, this thinking, if carried to an ultimate conclusion, would make it impracticable for the Government to accept a low bid if the parts and manuals of a higher bidder are already in the repair parts supply system."

In other words, if a fellow gets this business and supplies a manual, apparently, he stays in the business, even though his bids continued to be high.

Then, turning to page 104 of the report (p. 59-60 of this hearing), there is the following:

"Unwarranted obligations of funds. The initial amount of the contract was \$80,835,000, but by September 7, 1955, the amount was increased to \$353,822,495. The staff ascertained that as of September 23, 1955, orders placed against the contract amounted to \$242,960,217, with estimated requisitions on hand of about \$3.2 million. When it was pointed out to an official of ASO that the contract had been increased to over \$100 million more than orders and requisitions on hand, he said steps were being taken to modify the contract."

That is a case of ordering \$100 million worth more than was needed, apparently.

Now, on page 105 (p. 60 of this hearing) is the following statement:

"One contractor found that it took 98 weeks, on the average, to get a modification kit required as a result of an engineering change proposal, shipped to the planes requiring the change."

It took 98 weeks to get it to the planes requiring change.

Turning to page 106 (p. 61 of this hearing):

"One contractor reported the Air Force procedure of double identification of parts—double identification—"is unwieldy and costly."

Turning to page 109 (p. 62 of this hearing):

"Another contractor reported that he ordered, at Air Force request, a carload of steer hides as part of the bulk items list for concurrent spares on an aircraft."

And they demanded that he attach a drawing. He measured the steer hides and could not find any two alike.

"The contractor tried to write a pattern description but could find no two of the steer hides of the same dimensions. Consequently it was impossible for him to submit a drawing."

And under those conditions the matter was delayed at considerable expense.

We turn then to page 111 (p. 63 of this hearing), where it is charged that:

"At one Air Force facility (it was) disclosed that the Government representatives were

exercising little control over the price the contractor was charging for spare parts."

For example, in less than a 3-year period one item increased from \$8.53 each to \$15.74.

There are other specific charges. One is with regard to the radio transmitter, where about \$11 million worth of them got lost. We still have not found them, and they are procuring still others.

Secretary WILSON. Where is that?

Mr. WHITTEN. That was page 115 (p. 65 of this hearing).

One page 116 (p. 65 of this hearing) it is indicated, with regard to aircraft propellers, 157 were procured at a cost of \$1,413,000. In the supply report 62 propellers were accounted for, leaving 95 unaccounted for.

"A special inventory was taken in March 1955 at which time 115 propellers were located. However, 42 propellers worth \$378,000 were still unaccounted for."

The story which appears on pages 116 and 117 (pp. 65 and 66 of this hearing) on the Chateauroux Depot shows that the records were in a terrible state and the supplies on hand did not tally at all with the reported inventory.

Then on page 117 (p. 66 of this hearing) it is reported:

"CAMA submitted a listing of excess property to the Sacramento, Calif., Air Materiel area wherein 99 line items valued at \$632,540.38 were declared excess to CAMA requirements and disposition instructions were requested to alleviate storage problems. * * * It was stated that 45 of the 99 line items declared excess were subjects of current procurement actions."

In other words, 99 of the items were declared surplus and were set up for sale, at the same time that you were buying 45 of the 99 through other people.

Turning to page 120 (p. 67 of this hearing), the same types of inventory errors are pointed out. I would point out pages 127, 128, 129 (pp. 71 and 72 of this hearing), the relationship with Western Electric (p. 73 of this hearing), page 141 (pp. 77 and 78 of this hearing) on deficient record. Page 144 (p. 79 of this hearing) where \$70,000 payment for expedition was jumped to \$1,341,103.98. I would point out Convair, General Motors, and page 158 (p. 87 of this hearing), where additional costs to the Government piled up for 2 years while the failure of the contractor was being considered.

If these are typical—and there is every reason to believe they are—the Government is spending billions needlessly to someone's profit.

There are illustrations in this investigation where mistakenly we were supposed to pay \$2,100 per unit and the company inadvertently submitted a bill at the rate of \$2,700 per unit and the Government paid the \$2,700, and then everybody was embarrassed to find out they had paid all that extra money.

I had extreme difficulty in getting this investigators' report printed in the hearings of this committee. I finally managed to get it done. Not only that, but I had another problem in getting Secretary Wilson to come before the committee so that we could question him in regard to it. And we did. He came before us, and he made this significant statement.

He said:

I read this record—

Referring to the investigation of the military department, and I refer to Secretary Wilson after we managed to get him before the committee. He said:

I assure you that this looks like a very bad record. I read the record over all last Sunday and spent all day reading the material. I came into my office Monday morning and I said "Well, I am mad, and sad." I did not like that kind of a record. I was

sad to have such a poor relative performance with your good committee, and that is about all I can say about it.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. FORD. I was not cognizant of any reluctance on the part of Mr. Wilson to come before the committee.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I agree with the gentleman, that I saw no reluctance on his part.

Under our procedure in the Congress, concerning which I differ with many of my fine colleagues, who incidentally have served on this subcommittee much longer on this particular subcommittee longer than I, though I served on this committee during the war. Erroneously in my opinion, under existing policy when we provide for a contract, the Congress appropriates the full amount of money for the contract in advance, although it may have 4 or 5 years to run or for the money to become due. As a result, we have to give the Department of Defense the right to use funds for a different purpose from that which they justified before the committee and from that for which we thought they were going to spend it. Later we have the job of trying to keep up with how they actually spent the funds.

As a result of giving them all this money in advance—and I think this statement will be uncontradicted—the Department of Defense as of today will have—that is, on the 1st of July this year—more money on hand than it will expend next year. And yet we are giving them thirty-billion-odd dollars in addition under the policy I describe. This is under what I think is an erroneous policy of Congress, appropriating billions years in advance of its actually having to be expended.

I think if this waste as shown by the investigation were cut out, which Mr. Wilson himself said made him mad and sad and he hated to know his Department had such as record as that, and if this money that they have a right to debilitate and use for other purposes were properly used, then I think the Congress was right and the House in the original bill was right in saying that they did not need another \$1 billion or approximately \$1 billion, which is included in this conference report.

The only basis for approving the Senate increase, with which we have gone along, in my judgment is this. Evidently they feel that is the only way to get the emphasis on these particular programs, the increase in production of the B-52 and these other procurement programs, to give them additional money in a package for that purpose, as we have done. And if that is essential to meet the need for additional emphasis, I subscribe to it. I had hoped that our report would so express it. I thought, when I voted in the conference for the increase that it would. Unfortunately, they gave me no chance to go over the language of the report. The only basis for the conference report, in my opinion, is that you have to give them this extra money in order to get them to do this particular

job, and I do not think we should have to do it. I regret that the report does not so express our action as I was led to believe it would.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] knows, we discussed his point of view yesterday in the conference. For a time some of us in the conference felt yesterday that his position was that if the Air Force had better procurement methods we would not have to give the Air Force \$800 million for aircraft procurement. We all want better procurement, and I am sure improvements can be made. And I believe he would be the first to admit that certain improvements have been made. But, again, I am sure he did not mean to leave the impression that we can improve our procurement to the extent of \$800 million so that then we would not have to appropriate the money to procure these aircraft, guided missiles, and other items.

If I might turn to the Army part of this program for just a minute. The only significant changes from the House version in the conference report, as far as the Army is concerned, are these. We gave additional money for the National Guard Armory construction program, in the amount of \$15 million overall. They did make a fairly good case before our panel on the House side for that amount. However, we stayed with the budget figure. Subsequent to the presentations to the House, the Department of Defense and the Army got together and broke some construction roadblocks, so that it permitted them to obligate the funds that had previously been held up. With those roadblocks opened up, there was a need for additional funds for this purpose.

In addition, we gave additional funds for the Army National Guard to permit their personnel strength to go up to 425,000. All indications would lead one to believe that their strength can easily go to 425,000 rather than the Budget figure of 407,000. If the strength does not go up—we all want it to go up—the money will not be spent. If it does go to where they hope, then the money will be available.

I should like to add just 1 or 2 words about this \$800 million item. As the gentleman from Kansas indicated, some of us made an effort to reach a lower compromise figure, but we realized the facts of life, when the votes were counted. All of us understand the political implications involved in this specific issue.

As a practical matter, I think this is where we find ourselves. We are making available \$800 million in the aircraft procurement account now which will have the net effect of reducing the fiscal 1958 budget by an equal amount. Secretary Quarles said the other day that the Air Force budget for fiscal 1958 will approximate \$23 billion rather than about \$16 billion for fiscal 1957. It is my feeling from hearing all the experts testify that we have just added \$800 million to fiscal 1957 and in turn we are going to subtract \$800 million from fiscal 1958. In other words, all you are doing is pre-funding, pre-financing.

The gentleman from Texas made a remark or two about asking certain military leaders whether they want more money or more planes. He used the analogy of the farmer who would like more land or who would like better crops. Of course the farmers' answer would be "Yes." But maybe this is a little better analogy from our point of view. I do not use the term with the wrong connotation, but we can rightfully call ourselves politicians. If you ask a politician whether he wants more votes he always says, "Yes."

I think the Air Force has an insatiable appetite. If you ask them if they want more money their inevitable answer is "Yes," just as we would say we would like more votes on election day. Their response and ours are in good faith although neither may be right. I signed the conference report and will vote for its adoption although the House version of this bill was preferable.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, having controlled time on many pieces of legislation over a long period of years, I know how difficult it is to satisfy Members who wish to talk. For that reason I am deeply grateful to my friend from Texas for being so generous as to grant me 1 minute. I had hoped, having served for more than a score of years on the Armed Services Committee, charged with the responsibility for the defense of this Nation, that I might have a little longer time to express my views on this particular conference report.

We are in a most peculiar position at this moment. Usually the Executive demands more money than the Congress is willing to grant. Now the Congress is trying to cram down the throat of the Executive department a billion dollars which the President, the National Security Council, the Director of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force have never requested and could not wisely spend.

If we vote for this conference report it will lead only to an unbalanced budget and to unwise and extravagant spending and a waste of public funds. If we stand by our guns, as the bill originally passed the House, we will have at the end of the next fiscal year \$13 billion for the Air Force more than they possibly can use.

Mr. Speaker, any wise man will never underestimate the strength of his adversary in war, politics, or love. As the old Confederate general, Nathan B. Forrest, once said—the man who wins in battle is "the one who gets there fustest with the mostest." We all realize that it is better to have too much, too soon—than to have too little, too late. Certainly we do not want to take any chances for the defense and security of our Nation. At the same time we should not commit

the other great error of overestimating our enemy's strength or underestimating our own. We must not become paralyzed with fear of an exaggerated opinion of the strength of our potential enemy where that strength does not exist.

Mr. Speaker, when we speak of national defense we must think not only of planes, tanks, guns, and ships, but must consider the farms, factories, forests, and morale of our own people.

No nation can build up and maintain military might without preserving its economic strength. America was the arsenal of democracy that supplied the food and fiber, munitions and sinews of war—not only to feed, clothe, and supply our own Armed Forces of 12 million men and women in World War II but that took care of our allies as well.

Every great military leader, in all branches of our services, has more than once admitted to me that the one thing that brought victory to the Allied Powers over the Axis forces in World War II was America's industrial might and productive capacity. The battlefield can never be stronger than the home front and in modern mechanized warfare, it requires from 18 to 20 workers back home to supply and support each man on the battlefield. You simply cannot have military might without economic strength. And this, sir, more than the atomic or hydrogen bomb, has deterred further Russian aggression—and no one realizes it more than the Russians themselves.

No loyal, red-blooded American is going to gamble with our Nation's security in these trying and troublesome times, which our President has so well described "an age of peril." World events have taken a long time to get us in our present predicament and it will be a long time before we get out of it.

Many foolish charges have been made that Russia is now or soon will be stronger than we are in a military sense. I just do not believe it, nor do any of the best informed and highly trained experts in all branches of our services believe it. I want to make it clear that the retired general and former Chief of Staff of the Army, Matthew Ridgway, and that the commander of our Strategic Air Command in the Air Force, General Curtis LeMay, are two of our best soldiers who have my great admiration and high confidence. In fact, I have a sort of fond personal affection for each of these warriors who have done battle and rendered incalculable service to their country.

Mr. Speaker, I would lose all of my respect for each of these distinguished, outstanding military leaders if he did not fight hard for his own branch of our services. They would not be worth their salt if they did not.

Let me remind Members that our Defense Department is a terribly big organization, spending more money each year than the 16 largest corporations in our country—60 percent of all the taxpayers' money. But, sir, we have only one pie to cut, and we must distribute the cutting of the pie in such fashion as our military establishment requires and our domestic economy can stand. No general ever had an army big enough to

command just as no preacher ever had a congregation large enough to lecture. The different branches of our services, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and the Air Force make their budgets to meet what they feel to be their minimum requirements in order to carry out their particular missions and to meet our international obligations.

When the Department of Defense receives these requests, they are sent to the Bureau of the Budget where they are carefully screened and then sent down to Capitol Hill for the Committees on Armed Services in the House and Senate to consider.

Our Committee on Armed Services in the House of Representatives is composed of 37 members at the present time—the largest legislative committee in either House of Congress, composed of 20 Democrats and 17 Republicans. There is less partisanship in our Committee on Armed Services, in the House at least, than you will find in any committee in Congress because we realize that we all are in the same boat and will sink or swim together.

After long, careful, and exhaustive hearings, we report a bill to the House just as the Senate does. And after the passage in both House and Senate the bill goes to conference where we try to iron out the differences and send to the White House a bill the President can sign that will redound to the benefit of all our people. It should not be otherwise.

Now, before the bill becomes a law, it is usually reviewed again by the Secretary of Defense who is charged primarily with the security of our Nation, and then sent to the White House. No doubt the President consults with the National Security Council composed of the President, the Vice President, Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense, Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization, with a Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs.

Let no one think that getting any bill through Congress is a simple or easy task. It goes through a long, arduous and tortuous road that is checked and double checked by our high Government officials before it is signed by the President.

Mr. Speaker, I have, I repeat, high admiration and great respect for both General Ridgway and General LeMay, but their testimony could be very dangerous to the American people. I am not willing to put the judgment of either or both of these men above that of the peoples' elected representatives on our committee and the Secretary of Defense, who must consider economic, as well as military factors—and certainly not above the National Security Council or—the Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, Dwight D. Eisenhower, who is no altogether without a little military experience. The President must consider the recommendations of his Secretary of Defense who bases his judgment upon—not one Chief of Staff but all three Chiefs of Staff under the chairmanship of Admiral Radford at the present time, and upon the National Security Council. After all the final responsibility is upon the President.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is to keep our Armed Forces on an even keel and in balance.

Because of the rapid change in the methods and techniques of modern, mechanized warfare we must have a new look and a reappraisal as to where we can spend our money to do the most good.

After reading some of the testimony given in recent weeks and many newspaper articles by the arm-chair strategists one would get a wholly distorted picture of our Defense Establishment—thrown wholly out of focus. We will always need an Army, Navy, and Air Force, and I trust none of us will be so puerile and immature as to put all our eggs in one basket. We must remain strong on land, sea, and in the air—but I hope that no one will get the impression that we can place all of our faith in the Strategic Air Command or in guided missiles. This is a lopsided view. It is unrealistic and most dangerous. When we talk of national defense we must consider not only planes, tanks, guns, ships and munitions, but we must think of overall strength of America—her farms, factories, forests, and a strong, healthy domestic economy plus the intellectual, moral, and patriotic devotion of all our people to make this country strong and invincible to attack from enemies both from without and within.

The Soviets are hoping that we will spend ourselves into bankruptcy and a bankrupt country never licked anybody—and it never will. The Communists are praying that we will knock ourselves out by our own profligacy. I plead with each and every one of you, for America's sake, let us not be swept off our feet by dangerous propaganda. Let us follow men who look at the picture not from a single aspect but who consider it in its totality. We must see the problem and see it whole.

Only yesterday the senior Senator from Florida pointed out that the billion of dollars, added by the Senate, would produce two results: First, a tendency to bring the budget out of balance; and, second, encourage wasteful spending practices. Those of us who have studied this problem long and hard know that we do not have the existing plant facilities, nor the trained mechanics to spend this money wisely and well. And if we could get the planes—we do not have sufficient bases or trained pilots to man them.

It was also pointed out by the senior Senator from Virginia that we will have \$19.4 billion available for aircraft procurement on this July 1. The Air Force cannot economically and efficiently spend for this purpose more than 6.4 billion by June 1957—so that a year from now we will have an unexpended balance of some \$13 billion.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what motives are behind the action taken by the other body, except to remind the American people that this is an election year, and perhaps some people who are hungry for a political issue are scraping the bottom of the barrel. A new Congress will meet next January and will still have billions of dollars to spend for the building up of our Armed

Services, but why should we now—with our staggering debt of \$278 billion and with the backbreaking burden of taxation upon us vote an additional billion dollars which the President, a great military leader, the National Security Council, the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff, have not wanted and did not request? I do not like, sir, this being rammed down their throats and our throats. Even if the judgment of other men is honest, I think it is mistaken and that this House today should not place an additional, onerous burden upon the backs of our overburdened taxpayers. In my humble but honest opinion that would weaken rather than strengthen our defense.

What I have said has not been easy or pleasant to say, but I say it from the depths of my heart and conviction of my soul.

Mr. Speaker, under leave granted, I include the following editorial from last night's Washington Evening Star:

THE UNWANTED BILLION

The country has just been treated to a rare spectacle on Capitol Hill—the spectacle of the Senate insisting that the Air Force accept an extra billion dollars which the latter says it does not need and cannot spend efficiently.

Ordinarily it is the other way, with the executive agencies asking for more money than Congress is willing to give. In this same session, for instance, the House chopped a billion dollars out of the administration's foreign-aid requests, and remained deaf to all pleas that the full amount was urgently needed to maintain the security of the West.

The vote on the Air Force billion is being pictured as a sharp setback for the administration, and perhaps it is. The President, the National Security Council, the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Air Force, and the Air Force Chief of Staff had not wanted this additional billion. In effect, it is being rammed down their throats. But if it is a setback, in this sense, for the administration, it is hard to see how the Democrats can thereby derive any political advantage. The vote, 48 to 40, was largely on partisan lines, with only 5 Republicans supporting the increase and only 3 Democrats opposing it. But it is going to be difficult, and perhaps dangerous, for the Democrats to try to make political capital out of their feat. For the average voter, assuming there is no war, is apt to take a dim view of having to fork over a billion dollars in added taxes to cover an appropriation which the administration did not want and which the Air Force certainly cannot spend this year or next year. If the issue comes down this summer to a matter of politicking, it seems to us that the Republicans will be pretty well armed for the battle.

So perhaps the fair assumption is that this was not a partisan vote, that the action reflects an honest difference of opinion as to what will best serve the national security. If this is the case, the question is what effect will the added billion have on the production of aircraft, primarily B-52's.

Senators BYRD and HOLLAND, 2 of the 3 Democrats voting against the increase, thought it would do more harm than good. According to Senator BYRD's figures, the Air Force on this July 1, without the added billion, will have \$19.4 billion available for aircraft procurement. He estimated that the Air Force will spend for this purpose \$6.4 billion by June 30, 1957, thus winding up a year from now with an unexpended balance of some \$13 billion. Senator HOL-

LAND cited similar figures and ventured the opinion that the added billion would produce two principal results: (1) A tendency to bring the budget out of balance, and (2) encourage wasteful spending practices.

Chairman RUSSELL, of the Armed Services Committee carried the burden of the argument for the Democrats. He cut Defense Secretary Wilson into small pieces, but he offered nothing tangible to show that the production of B-52's would be speeded up. Senator SYMINGTON said that better programming would result from the added billion, and he pointed out that the Air Force budget as submitted to Congress was some \$3 billion under the amount originally requested by the Air Force Chief of Staff, General Twining. It is also worth noting that General LeMay, head of the Strategic Air Force, has advocated more money, and that Air Force Secretary Quarles, while opposing any increase now, has said that more money would be needed in 1958 to meet the goals set for 1959 and 1960.

What all of this will shake down to is anyone's guess. A billion dollars will buy something more than 100 B-52's. But we doubt whether the Senators who supported the increase really know whether we will get more of the big bombers sooner as a result of the vote.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN].

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, my attitude is exactly like my colleague who preceded me and who is the ranking minority member on the Armed Services Committee and eminently qualified to discuss with the Members this important matter provided he had the time to do so. We are considering today the question of a billion-dollar appropriation and it is to be ended with 1 hour of debate. We who spent weeks and months holding hearings on the aircraft industry are granted 1 minute to present our thinking on this billion dollar increased appropriation.

When the amendment was presented in the House several weeks ago for the billion-dollar increase for the Air Force, it was turned down. And on a standing vote less than 10 Members voted for it. I think, if I recall correctly, 4 Members out of 435 voted for the amendment to grant the increase.

However, the House conferees have readily accepted the action taken in the other body. The fact is regardless of how much we appropriate, even if we appropriated \$5 billion, it would not produce more planes. The argument for the billion-dollar increase is that it would increase the production of planes. In my opinion it will be necessary to have plant expansion, increased machine tools and equipment, and recruitment of manpower, which would take considerable time, before many more planes could be produced. After this has been accomplished, then it would be in order to appropriate money for increased production and certainly the Members of the House would readily appropriate the money if more planes could be produced.

The plants now manufacturing planes, regardless of the type of plane being produced, are taxed to capacity. It is not a matter of money but a matter of plants, equipment, and manpower to produce the planes. Certainly granting an increase of a billion dollars is not going to solve the problem.

The entire military appropriation was \$33,635,000,000, not including construction. Of this the Air Force was authorized \$15,479,125,000, \$739,361,000 more than fiscal year 1956. As of July 1, 1956, the Air Force will have unobligated \$3,334,000,000. Authorized and partly obligated, but unexpended, \$17,510,597,000.

Therefore it does not make sense to me to increase the appropriation at this time.

I reiterate the Congress is ready to appropriate any money necessary, providing we can get the planes. But to get more planes, we must have increased facilities, equipment, and technical and skilled manpower. To just appropriate more money is putting the cart before the horse. Some of these plants now, I presume, from what I have observed, are working around the clock to turn out the production already scheduled on their books.

The President and his administration, in my opinion, have greater and better knowledge of what is required to meet our defense needs and if in his estimation it was needed, I firmly believe he would request it and it would be readily granted.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear enough that for the moment we will get no additional planes for the additional money provided in this report. There will be no additional planes built during the current fiscal year, as a result of voting these \$800 million. But we will have the assurance of many more planes at an earlier date by going ahead with this program now. That is the important thing to consider. Of course, the services have more money already earmarked for planes than they can spend for the next fiscal year. That is not the question. That has nothing to do with this. We seek to insure the delivery of additional planes that are vital for the defense of this country at an earlier date. That is exactly what these funds will do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. May I proceed just a little bit further, please?

Mr. Speaker, since we debated this matter in the House, General Twining has gone to Russia.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan for a question.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not have any question now.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan if he desires it.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan withdraw his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Yes; temporarily, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. SIKES. Does the gentleman from Michigan desire me to yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SIKES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have noticed that when we have appropriated money, especially for the construction of planes, that immediately thereafter was a demand for an increase in wages in the plant which was awarded a contract. Can the gentleman tell me if we appropriate this money, will there be an increase in wages which will absorb all of the increase or will we get more planes?

Mr. SIKES. I do not have a crystal ball to look into the future. I can only say that this is intended to provide more planes and it will do that. I cannot guarantee what the cost of production is going to be.

Mr. Speaker, since we debated this matter in the House, General Twining has gone to Russia for a look at the Soviet air picture. Already information is coming back to us regarding the remarkable progress made by the Russian aircraft industry, both in advanced design and in numbers. There is evidence that the Soviets are ahead of us in air-plant production, and if they are ahead of us, we cannot take chances on such an important matter. It is not only in the production of modern B-52's that we are behind. We are behind in the production of badly needed jet tankers. We are seriously deficient in numbers of transport craft needed to insure rapid movement of military forces. It will be within the discretion of the Secretary of Defense to correct any of these deficiencies if additional funds are voted. Mr. Speaker, I believe planes are cheaper than wars. Defense is America's only real security today. This will help us to have an adequate defense.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my word to that of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES], who just preceded me. You know what the issue is. I am not concerned at this point with ramming down anybody's throat these funds. There are Members in the other body who are willing to ram down the throat of the President, who are willing to ram down the throat of the Secretary of Defense, who are willing to ram down the throat of the National Security Council \$500 million. My friends on the other side of the aisle in this committee of conference were willing to ram down the same identical and collective throats \$500 million. It depends on how big, in the case of national security, you think the respective throats are. It just depends who is doing the ramming.

I say that the other body is sound in its judgment in presenting to this House this conference report. Your conferees went there. The other body had the benefit of information that this House did not have. Had this House had the benefit of the information and testimony which the other body had, then I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this House would have acted in the first instance as did the

other body. There was only one dissent—only one vote against this—in the other body. There are five Members of the other body who indicated that they would have voted "aye" if they had been present. They did that with the same feeling of caution, the same feeling of understanding that do we. The decision of the conference was not just an idle gesture. This was not something done off the cuff. This was done based upon testimony and evidence of the greatest generals and leaders of the Air Force—not civilians, but the men who fight the wars and the men who plan the attacks; the men who plan the planes.

I submit this conference committee should be complimented by the people of this Nation for bringing back to this body, with courage and intelligence and sound judgment, this report.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] has expired.

Mr. OSTERTAG. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Defense Department Appropriations Subcommittee, I am convinced that the billion dollar increase in our defense appropriation bill, particularly the funds which are allocated to the Air Force cannot be spent in the next fiscal year. Moreover, the Air Force has indicated that it does not need this money and does not want it. It simply means that the Air Force will wind up next year with an unexpended balance of about \$13 billion instead of \$12 billion. Somewhere in the neighborhood of nineteen to twenty billion dollars are now available for aircraft procurement. This additional money will not produce a single bomber a day earlier. If the advocates of this increase want to produce more bombers at a faster rate, it would seem that funds and efforts should be directed toward additional tooling for such production. B-52 bombers will require other considerations and in no way are these factors being given consideration by the advocates of more funds. Military personnel and facilities, as well as bases and other factors are essential to their use and operation. Training is also a factor. All of these matters must be coordinated and developed together if we are to achieve our purposes.

I concur with our chairman in his expressed view that our Defense Establishment will require more money in the next few years than that appropriated this year. This can be understood when thought is given to the prospects of accelerated production of heavy bombers, guided and ballistic missiles, and other important aircraft such as tankers. All of these developments will require increased appropriations; but to appropriate money now in the certain knowledge that it cannot be used during this next year, invites the suspicion and the charge of politicking. Actually, no real harm will come from giving them more than they need. I assume it will not be spent and will remain available for use in subsequent years. Actually we are appropriating, in my judgment, a billion dollars or at least \$800 million this year which will automatically reduce the budget requirements for next year.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SHORT) there were—ayes 79, noes 57.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I understood there would be no roll call votes today.

Mr. MAHON. If a rollcall is ordered, we will have to pass it over.

Mr. SPEAKER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The minority leader instructs me not to. So I will withdraw it.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14, page 27, line 19, insert "of which not to exceed \$57,853,000 may be transferred to the appropriation, 'Military personnel, 1956'."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke on the conference report may have permission to revise and extend their remarks, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERTAG] may extend his remarks immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the con-

sideration of H. R. 7535, with Mr. WALTER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] had 2 hours and 13 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] had 2 hours and 15 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN].

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, to start with, we must look for the purpose as stated by the President and by the Department of Education, the United States Commissioner of Education, as to what they propose to do in the administration of this fund or of these three funds, under title I, title II, and title III.

When Mrs. Hobby appeared before our committee she stated what the President himself has stated many times, that there are and were firm conditions that must be carried out in the Federal aid program. First there must be a proved need of the school district that is to participate in these funds; second, there must be a proved lack of local income. Now, who is going to prove the need and the lack of income? Why, the Commissioner of Education and his augmented staff of personnel that will be scattered all over this country trying to pick out from the 57,000 separate school districts in this country the ones that satisfy the czarlike powers of the Commissioner of Education to determine what the need is and what the income is of a particular district. Just think what that means in the building up and in the strengthening of the personnel of a bureaucracy? And think what it means in political largess in the particularly close election States or congressional districts where he is going to take the money from some and redistribute it to others according to his notion of what the need is.

There is no formula set out in this bill, there is no control of this House over those who shall receive the proceeds of these appropriations which will amount to approximately \$8 billion.

Let us see if there is a need by the Department's own statement. On page 751 of the hearings before the committee, this question was asked of the Assistant Secretary of the Department, Mr. Perkins:

Mr. GWINN. Now, will you give me and this committee examples of school districts in any State that cannot finance themselves if they remove their own limitations or if they are unable themselves to finance themselves where they cannot call on their own State for such aid?

Here is the answer:

Well, if we are going to take State aid into the picture, I would be inclined personally from what little I have available as personal information to the view that every school district could finance itself. That is, if we are going to take State aid into account. In other words, as I indicated yesterday, the credit of the States themselves is good and the States could issue bonds of their own if they wanted to, which would help out the needy school districts. Thereby

they could make all districts able to obtain schools without Federal aid.

We all know that is true. It has been stated over and over again that there is not a State in this Union that is not more capable, better off financially and more able to take care of their own school needs than the Federal Government is.

There must be some other motive back of this perfectly astonishing, feeble, little door-opening process by which the Federal Government is coming into this picture of building schools. We have probably 1,500,000 schoolrooms in this country. The States have been able to take care of them up to now. When did they grow so feeble as to require this gimmick?

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order there is not a quorum present. This is a magnificent, factual speech that is being made and we ought to have more here to listen to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and two Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. GWINN. Where did we get the facts about this need that the Government claims exists in the States? Not from the States. There has not been a single legislator or a single political body representative of a single State that has petitioned the Congress to give them Federal aid lest their children go without schoolrooms or school chairs or textbooks or otherwise suffer for lack of education, not one. And we Members know of our own knowledge that the States do not neglect their own children and that the Federal Government has no higher concept of the duty of parents and citizens to their children than the States and the parents themselves.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], the author of the bill.

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Is the gentleman satisfied that in the great city of New York the schools are adequate? I think there was testimony before the committee to show that even in the city of New York there were many schools that were old, even up to 75 years of age; that they were firetraps, and that many children were going to school part days because there were not sufficient facilities for them.

Mr. GWINN. We had no exact testimony on the point before our committee.

Mr. BAILEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GWINN. I would like to answer the question of the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania first.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. The point of order is that a Member who seeks recognition must first address the Chair rather than inquire of the Member whether he will yield or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The practice which has grown up here is not a good one. When

a request is made for a Member to yield, the request should be made to the Chair, and the Chair in turn submits the request to the speaker having the floor.

Mr. GWINN. New York City has not petitioned this body for help. Why should this body seek to impose its will of Federal aid on the city of New York? Why should we think, as regards the funds from West Virginia and Pennsylvania, we can manage their charity to New York City better than they do themselves? Why should we bring the State's money down here, mush it around an incredible period of time, and send it back where it came from in the first place? This is pure compulsory State aid to Uncle Sam to enable him to manage our classrooms and our children on the rankest pretext that he can do it better than the people can themselves.

Now, what about New York and New York City? Under title I of this bill, the Kelley bill, New York State will be required to pay \$74 million per year—under title I, I am talking about now—and receive back \$32,794,000. So, in effect, for New York City to get 1 schoolroom it would have to pay the Federal Government for 2 schoolrooms. That is necessary in order to get money to hand around to other places. So, when the Members say that the situation in Chicago and in New York and in Hammond, Ind., and other places is perfectly terrible, we have got to look to the Federal Government, you are simply closing your eyes to the language of the bill. They will not get a net dime from those funds. They are on the paying end permanently, not on the receiving end.

You must close your ears. You must knock yourselves on the head to entertain the idea that most of your areas will get a net dime out of this bill.

For the majority to say that they are getting Federal aid for their constituents would be a rank deception. They will not do that. And if we should go home and say, "We will get Federal aid to you, we are going to put every little tot in a new seat, and so on, and so forth," what utter hypocrisy that would be. Before this debate is over it will amount to knowing deception. The truth must be told them that in a majority of the States they will be forced without their consent to pay taxes to build schoolrooms in other States, but not their own.

Here is a record put out by the Department of Education itself showing what each State pays in taxes and what each State will get back in largess under the Kelley bill. These States get back less than they pay out. I will name them to you.

A record of this is on the page's table or out in the hall so that Members can get a picture of their own State, if they want to.

THE "PUT-AND-TAKE" FIGURES

Column 1 of the following table shows the percentage that each State pays of all taxes collected, for whatever purpose; column 2 shows on that basis how much each will contribute annually to the \$400 million annual fund; column 3 shows

how much each State will get back, according to the United States Office of Education:

State	Per- cent pay in	Dollars they will pay in	Dollars they will get back
Alabama	0.542	\$2,172,000	\$8,968,658
Arizona	.232	928,000	2,537,686
Arkansas	.226	904,000	5,313,957
California	7.620	30,480,000	26,545,819
Colorado	.897	3,588,000	3,611,322
Connecticut	1.841	7,364,000	4,782,562
Delaware	1.288	5,152,000	835,050
Florida	.967	3,868,000	7,623,902
Georgia	1.002	4,008,000	10,237,501
Idaho	.153	612,000	1,691,790
Illinois	8.228	32,912,000	20,247,262
Indiana	2.287	9,148,000	10,226,657
Iowa	.755	3,020,000	6,420,128
Kansas	.719	2,876,000	4,750,027
Kentucky	1.900	7,606,000	8,317,970
Louisiana	.744	3,096,000	8,090,229
Maine	.246	976,000	2,244,876
Maryland	2.726	10,904,000	16,202,148
Massachusetts	2.719	10,876,000	10,573,691
Michigan	8.711	34,844,000	17,058,887
Minnesota	1.516	6,064,000	7,699,816
Mississippi	.230	900,000	6,506,886
Missouri	2.532	10,128,000	9,174,710
Montana	.167	668,000	1,594,187
Nebraska	.585	2,340,000	3,220,909
Nevada	.121	484,000	466,327
New Hampshire	.174	712,000	1,279,688
New Jersey	2.944	11,776,000	11,343,672
New Mexico	1.152	608,000	2,320,790
New York	18.794	74,996,000	32,794,708
North Carolina	2.206	8,824,000	12,178,549
North Dakota	.091	364,000	1,724,325
Ohio	6.734	26,936,000	20,236,416
Oklahoma	.894	3,576,000	5,715,215
Oregon	.611	2,444,000	3,893,287
Pennsylvania	7.612	30,448,000	25,105,737
Rhode Island	.424	1,696,000	1,778,549
South Carolina	.361	1,444,000	7,005,748
South Dakota	.102	408,000	1,724,325
Tennessee	.729	2,916,000	9,174,710
Texas	3.120	12,480,000	21,982,431
Utah	.424	1,696,000	2,168,962
Vermont	.108	432,000	965,188
Virginia	1.539	6,156,000	9,207,244
Washington	1.184	4,736,000	6,355,059
West Virginia	.419	1,676,000	5,747,750
Wisconsin	1.857	7,428,000	8,740,918
Wyoming	.081	324,000	780,826
Hawaii	.194	776,000	1,409,825
Possessions	-----	-----	422,000
Total	99.656	398,664,000	400,000,000

¹ Maryland includes District of Columbia and Puerto Rico. Washington State includes Alaska.

See the States that will get less than they pay out. Especially is this so if you add to the cost under this bill the cost of administration and handling. We know that the cost of the Government managing our affairs is at least 30 to 35 percent. They cost us \$12 billion to \$15 billion of extra money before we start getting any relief or aid money back. So if you add 30 percent, or if that is high, 15 percent, to what we pay out directly in taxes under this bill, many borderline States will get back much less than they pay out.

California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York—New York pays 18.75 percent of all the taxes that are paid and it gets back and has been getting back for over 25 years now a liquidation of itself in the Federal aid process. And of course that is true of many other States, particularly Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois and California. But to go on with the list: Ohio, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Utah, Vermont, Wisconsin.

There are many others that are just over the line. That is the story of those that are clearly on the paying end and not on the receiving end. If you add the overhead cost the list of States increases.

I am going to offer an amendment to this bill substituting therefor the Scrivener bill, which simply says that after the Federal Government collects taxes it shall send a check back to each State for 1 percent of the total taxes collected from that State, to be kept by it for educational purposes. That will do perfect magic. The Southern States will be able to keep their own money at home and be better off than they will under this complicated, utterly fantastic, costly, even corrupt scheme to buy votes with the tax money taken from some of the States for the special benefit of others.

Let me give you an example. Take the State of Arizona, which we do not regard as a poor State or one really needing aid, but it somehow or other under the Government scheme of figuring gets back more than it pays in. If it kept 1 percent of its own taxes back home to manage itself and to control its own schools, keeping the Federal Government out of the State entirely, the picture would be this: Under the Kelley bill Arizona pays \$929,000 into this Federal-aid fund. It gets back \$2,537,000, or roughly \$1,600,000 more than it pays out. But if it kept 1 percent, with no bookkeeping, no control, it would keep of its own money \$1,531,000 and be substantially as well off. If you add the 30 percent for management by the Federal Government it would be much better off.

Now take Florida. Florida under the Kelley bill pays \$3,868,000 and gets back \$7,623,000 or a gain of \$3,756,000. If it kept 1 percent of its own income payments it would get back \$5,900,000 and be much better off.

Georgia under the Kelley bill will pay \$4 million and get back \$10 million, or a straight gift of \$6 million. If it kept 1 percent of its own income under the proposed amendment it would keep for its own management \$5,800,000.

In the case of Louisiana it works out not quite so well but substantially the same. Attached is the complete list of States:

TABLE I

	Income tax col- lections, fiscal year 1954 (in- cluding tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama	\$355,904,000	\$3,559,040
Arizona	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas	148,110,000	1,481,100
California	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut	1,163,589,000	11,635,890
Delaware	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia	581,573,000	5,815,730
Hawaii	126,170,000	1,261,700
Idaho	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota	917,256,000	9,172,560
Mississippi	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico	96,351,000	963,510
New York	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina	673,436,000	6,734,360

TABLE I—Continued

	Income tax col- lections, fiscal year 1954 (in- cluding tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
North Dakota	\$60,929,000	\$609,290
Ohio	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island	271,663,000	2,716,630
South Carolina	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah	135,924,000	1,359,240
Vermont	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming	51,764,000	517,640
Alaska	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia	707,455,000	7,074,550
Puerto Rico	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

NOTE.—Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

The Department of Education, which is the source of most of the information we have, is an unreliable source. When we stand up here and say we have a terrible shortage of schoolteachers and a terrible shortage of classrooms, we are simply parroting what we have been told by the Department that already controls our thoughts, even the thoughts of this House; they are often not true.

The President's own Committee on Intergovernmental Activity made a report showing that over the last 50 years and for longer than that our school-teaching force has kept almost exactly in the same relation to pupils all the way through, and that there is no sudden increase or decrease in need for teachers. That is true of the school classrooms. It is false to talk about there being a sudden need for classrooms and that the poor States are so miserable that the Federal Government must come forward with help it is incapable of giving. The classrooms have retained the same relation to pupils for the last 50 or more years according to the President's own committee report. We do not hear about that. It has no emphasis on it by the same Department that puts out its own propaganda of shortages.

To show you how utterly unreliable and even ridiculous and, therefore, highly deceptive the Federal Government Education Department can be, let me show you this survey of school facilities made by it in 1952. It has been put out and circulated widely and financed by Congress. According to it, not a single State is able to take care of itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, much of my life has been devoted to the promotion of the cause of education. It is a cliché and probably trite for me to say that a democracy cannot function with complete success unless it has an educated electorate. Ignorance and illit-

eracy make fertile ground for the demagog.

At one time I was chairman of the board of education of my home city of Rome, a town of approximately 40,000 people situated in the beautiful foothills of northwest Georgia. While I served upon the board of education, it was my privilege to sponsor the necessary bond issues to construct schools to try to meet the growing demand for classrooms. When I was a member of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, I served on one of the two house committees on education and did everything I could to advance the cause of education in my State.

When I was elected to Congress, one of the things I promised the people of my State was that I would do my best to secure Federal aid for our schools. I am convinced that it is one of the obligations of the Federal Government to help those States which are unable because of the limitation of their resources to furnish school buildings and educational facilities for their children. It has always seemed to me that the money should be taken where it can be found and spent where it is needed in the field of education.

Since I have been a Member of this House, it has been my privilege to support and vote for legislation giving aid to defense-impacted areas, and this legislation has been of vast help to many counties of my State. Even though the State of Georgia has just about completed a huge school-building program through the device of a school-building authority, nevertheless, these federally impacted areas could not have supplied the necessary school buildings and equipment to care for the great influx of children into their schools without Federal aid. Moreover, I have tried to promote the cause of vocational education, and as a member of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, which provides the money for vocational education, it has been my pleasure to help secure the maximum amount of money authorized by the George-Barden Act.

It has been the experience of the boards of education and the superintendents of the schools receiving funds for vocational education and help under Public Laws 815 and 874 that the Federal Government has not attempted to exercise any unreasonable supervision of the aid thus given to my State. The Commissioner of Education and his office have been most cooperative and have, I think, done a remarkable job promoting the building of schools and the operation of the schools in federally impacted areas.

In no wise has our Government in the past sought to invade the field of social legislation or to use the funds provided under those school laws to interfere with the social pattern and the educational heritage and customs of my State.

Nor do I find objectionable the provision in the bill now under consideration for fixing the wage scales under the Bacon-Davis Act. I have always insisted that wage scales in the South in all fields of labor should be just as high as they are in the North because the

workers of the South are the most efficient and loyal to be found anywhere. They learn easily, they give a day's work for a day's pay and they are entitled to be paid just as much as or more than laborers are paid in other sections of our country.

But when an effort is made to bribe my State and the South with school construction money to accept the mixing of the races in our schools, I cannot vote for a bill so designed. It is reported that an amendment will be offered to this bill to deny funds to those States which have not submitted to the invalid invasion by the Supreme Court of the legislative power of the Congress in the infamous integration decision. The Court has its decision. Let it enforce it. The Congress should not be called upon to come to the rescue of the Court which has exceeded its powers and sought to amend the Constitution and to declare the law not what prior decisions have said it is but to be what they think it ought to be. The South does not intend to mix the races in the schools because it believes that to do so would be to break down the social barriers which at present prevent the temptation to intermarriage of the two races. This fear of intermarriage which would destroy both races and result in a race of halfbreeds and mongrels is the basic reason for the South's fight against integration in the schools. If integration in the schools is brought about and the social barriers between the two races are lowered, the next step will be to break down our laws against intermarriage between the races. Neither race should desire this but should seek to develop and preserve the good qualities which each can claim.

It is not a question of mixing an inferior and a superior race. It is the question of mixing two races each of which has many fine qualities which would probably be lost in a mongrelization of the races. The race which desires intermarriage with the other, by this very process, shows its feeling of inferiority.

Neither is it a question of denying to the Negro his civil rights such as the right to vote, the right to security of his person and property and the right to equal pay for the same type and kind of work. It is not a matter of race prejudice or bias. Certainly as far as I am concerned, I am sure I have no prejudice or bias against the Negro race. As a member of the Georgia General Assembly, I voted for the constitutional amendment which eliminated the poll tax as a requisite for voting and throughout my life have done everything I could, both as a member of the general assembly and with the school board of my home city, to advance the education of the Negro race. It is purely and simply a question of the mixing of the races in our schools and other forced social contacts to which we in the South object.

Consequently, we will not be bribed by any such legislation as is proposed to be adopted as an amendment to this bill.

The South will certainly use every legal means at its command to resist either the use of the carrot technique or that of the stick. We will not be driven, cajoled, or bought.

But whether or not the proposed amendment, denying funds to those States which have not integrated the races in the schools, is adopted makes little difference. As a matter of fact, I think the amendment will be defeated; for if I read the news reports correctly, assurances have been given to those favoring such an amendment that it is not necessary but that the desired result will be obtained either by administrative action or through the courts by means of an injunction forbidding the payment of funds to those States which have not integrated.

Consequently, I am unalterably opposed to this legislation. There is certainly an overwhelming need for it but so long as some seek to use the bill to accomplish unwise social and political ends and for political reasons, I cannot support or vote for it.

If the proposed amendment is submitted, I will certainly vote against it and whether or not it is adopted, my vote must be "nay" on H. R. 7535.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I want to say I favor this bill. I believe the classroom shortage is the great domestic crisis and that we should pass Federal aid to give construction help to alleviate that shortage this year. The various real problems involved with this bill are going to be discussed and have been discussed by other members of the committee. I want to direct my remarks to the brief time that I am permitted to address the Committee to the amendment which the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] says he will offer. That amendment which will provide that none of the money will go to any States maintaining segregated schools or any districts maintaining segregated schools was voted upon and considered in committee. It is an unfortunate coincidence that the consideration of this legislation, this very vital and important legislation, has come into conflict with the recent decision of the Supreme Court relating to segregation in the schools. It is ironic that in this area in the field of education where the proponents of desegregation and integrated schools have won their greatest victory, they are trying to push that victory further and further with such amendments as the gentleman from New York is going to offer when there are no such amendments offered in other fields such as FHA or hospitals where Hill-Burton money is expended. Even the other day, when we passed the conference report on the road bill, there was no provision that the roads would only be permitted to be used for nonsegregated buses.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. METCALF. I yield for a question.

Mr. YOUNGER. Does the gentleman know of any public road in the United States that practices segregation?

Mr. METCALF. I know of buses in the United States that travel over public roads that are segregated in violation of the Supreme Court decision.

Now let us get in proper perspective the timing of this decision. The first decision of the Supreme Court came down on May 17, 1954, holding that the 14th amendment prohibited the discrimination in education between the races because the maintenance of separate but equal schools was a denial of equal protection of the laws as guaranteed by the 14th amendment; and that the due process clause of the 5th amendment prevents such discrimination. The Court by that decision outlawed segregation, but the Court retained jurisdiction of the cases. The attorneys for the plaintiffs, and the NAACP, came back into that Court and said that segregation should be permitted immediately, and argued to the Court to that effect.

In the hearings, at page 1054, you can read what Mr. Shad Polier of the American Jewish Congress, and Mr. Clarence Mitchell, of the NAACP, said a few days before the second Supreme Court decision came down. They argued that it would be a repudiation of the first Supreme Court decision if the Congress did not pass implementing legislation, pointing out that section 5 of the 14th amendment provided that Congress had the power to enact such legislation. They guessed wrong. The Court could have left it to Congress to enact implementing legislation. That course would have been the easiest for the Court to take, but it would not have been the most straightforward.

The advances already made in applying the principle of equality have been achieved through resort to the Court, not to Congress: zoning, primaries, university education. Congress was not in the habit of taking responsibility in this field, or indeed in any of the other ramifications of the 14th amendment. That course would have resulted in impotence. We all recognize that in certain areas of this country no laws would be passed by State legislatures and in this Congress opponents of integration could effectively prevent implementing legislation and render the Court's decision impotent. But the Court refused to agree that implementing legislation was needed and affirmatively ordered desegregation.

In a recent article in the American Bar Association Journal the Attorney General of Georgia has made the same argument. He says that—

The Supreme Court usurped the prerogatives of the United States Congress. It handed down an implementation decision on May 31, 1955, in spite of the fact that the 14th amendment itself vests in Congress the power of implementation.

He was referring to section 5 of the 14th amendment:

Congress shall have the power to enforce by appropriate legislation the provisions of this article.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. RIVERS. The Court, in fact, did legislate in that decision.

Mr. METCALF. I hoped not to get into a controversy about the merits of the decision. In fact, that is an implementing decision and has the force and effect, as I see it, of legislation.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. LANDRUM. The distinguished gentleman from Montana is also a former distinguished member of the Montana Supreme Court, is he not?

Mr. METCALF. I served for 6 years on that court.

Mr. LANDRUM. I assume the gentleman has approached his study of this question from the standpoint of a jurist, trying to analyze it in the light of what this legislation can do in regard to authorizing an appropriation and making it available to all States.

Mr. METCALF. That is right.

Mr. LANDRUM. Is it the gentleman's opinion, in the light of that study, that whether or not the so-called Powell amendment should be adopted, the school not following the decision of the Supreme Court of May 17, 1954, will be denied funds?

Mr. METCALF. I think they can be, and they may be denied funds. I will elaborate on that in just a moment.

Mr. LANDRUM. Without any additions or amendments to the present legislation?

Mr. METCALF. The Powell amendment is not needed. Even if this bill does not pass, I believe that under the implementation decision of the Supreme Court, the Attorney General of the United States or the Commissioner of Education has the power to deny funds to the schools, for construction or for any other purpose.

Mr. LANDRUM. But if the bill should pass, the money authorized under its terms certainly could be withheld without the Powell amendment.

Mr. METCALF. Yes. They can withhold for a short time. I wish to elaborate on that.

I feel that the NAACP and the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] when he says, "Let us not repudiate the Supreme Court decision," is repudiating it himself in coming into this body and asking for implementing legislation, because the Supreme Court decision said, "Let us have a moderate approach."

Now Mr. POWELL comes along and says that the two decisions of the Supreme Court are not enough to prevent discrimination of minorities in violation of the 5th and 14th amendments, that it is necessary to have special legislation to carry out the decision of the Court. We have the anomalous situation of Attorney General Cook of Georgia on the one hand, and the gentleman from New York and the NAACP on the other, each trying to discredit and belittle the Supreme Court decision; each insisting that Congress has to pass legislation to put the decision into effect. But the Court retained jurisdiction of the cases before it and ordered the district courts to carry out the principles of the Constitution without congressional action.

If the decision of the Supreme Court that segregation in the schools is a deprivation of equal rights under the law, and a denial of the equal protection of the laws; if that decision needs further implementing legislation, such as the Powell amendment, to make it effective, then decisions of the Supreme Court and

provisions of the Constitution can be nullified if implementing legislation does not follow. If that is true, Congress can deny to the citizens of the United States the benefits of the Bill of Rights or the 14th amendment by failure to act or refusal to act.

I shall never agree to the proposition advanced that these provisions of the Constitution require legislation before they can be enforced.

I shall never concede that basic constitutional rights of American citizens can be withheld because of the failure or refusal of Congress to act.

I do not believe that to be the law and I will not vote for any proposition that concedes that the failure or refusal of Congress to act can nullify the Constitution.

But suppose the Powell amendment were adopted, would it contribute to an orderly solution of the problem? In the argument before the Supreme Court, attorneys for the NAACP urged prompt and immediate desegregation. The Supreme Court refused to make such an order, and refused to enter a direct decree which would have required immediate and indiscriminate admission of Negro students to schools hitherto reserved for white children. Now, by legislative act the Powell amendment would attempt to accelerate the process of integration of schools faster than the Supreme Court thought it should go.

Adlai Stevenson said in a speech in Portland, Oreg.:

And as a practical matter we must recognize that punitive action by the Federal Government may actually delay the process of integration in education.

We will not, for example, reduce race prejudice by denying to areas afflicted with it the means of improving the educational standards of all their people.

Certainly we will not improve the present condition or future prospects of any Negro citizen by coercive Federal action that will arm the extremists and disarm the men of good will in the South who, with courage and patience, have already accomplished so much.

Since the Supreme Court's decision there has been definite progress in many States toward integration in the schools. Except for an unsuccessful citizen's suit attempting to delay integration in the District of Columbia until the Supreme Court had rendered final judgment, integration has gone forward in the District, in Kansas, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and in parts of Maryland. If the States which maintained segregated schools be regarded as a region, rather than taken separately State by State, amazingly swift progress has been made, and the Supreme Court's directive that integration proceed with "deliberate speed" has been obeyed.

At this point I call attention to the following articles on the progress of compliance with the Supreme Court decision:

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

TWO YEARS OF ACHIEVEMENT

The Nation has been looking too long and too hard at the desegregation issue in the Deep South. It is time to look elsewhere.

If the extremism in five States of the Deep South were the only criterion of the results of the United States Supreme Court de-

cision against racial segregation in public schools, which came 2 years ago this week, then the American people would be justified in thinking there has been little progress. But is that true?

Let us inspect the picture in Missouri and surrounding States which also have had to meet the issue of school integration:

Missouri: Here is a State which was born with slavery and steeped in southern tradition in many areas. Though there had been much progress toward equality for all citizens, still few Missourians could have guessed prior to the Supreme Court decision of May 17, 1954, what has happened since.

What has happened, of course, is nearly complete integration of the public schools, plus advances in other fields. Even at the start of this school year, nearly 85 percent of the State's 65,000 Negro schoolchildren were attending integrated classes. Missouri's record is remarkable and has won nationwide study.

Kansas: Unlike Missouri, the Sunflower State was born of a battle to free the slaves, and its constitution specifically prohibited segregation except in a few big-city primary schools and Kansas City high schools. Yet Kansas in 1954 was a party with Southern States in the "States' rights" defense of school segregation before the Supreme Court.

Since the Court decision, however, five Kansas cities report complete integration of their schools and eight others have begun it. Hence Kansas shows that the Court's ruling has had an effect well outside the South, even on a State with Northern attitudes.

Oklahoma: Just a few years ago integration would have seemed unlikely in this State with a southern back door and a Western front door. But 273 of its schools began this term open to children of all races and many more districts have joined the integration movement, as have the State colleges.

The Sooner State's attitude was summed up by Attorney General Mac Q. Williamson who said: "Our (State) constitution begins with a clause saying that the laws shall not be in conflict with the supreme law of the land. We're still in the Union, so that is that."

Arkansas: Both attitudes and geography split Arkansas between Deep South and border State. The University of Arkansas was a southern pioneer in opening its doors to the minority race. Following the Supreme Court decision, Fayetteville, Charleston, and Hoxie decided to desegregate their schools, while the State colleges were opened to Negroes. Even the capital of Little Rock offered a desegregation proposal, though it was vague.

But a furor over the Hoxie case helped to mobilize the white supremacy advocates, and Gov. Orval Faubus, who had stood aloof from them, now favors the mystical doctrine of interposition. The land of opportunity is still debating whether to offer more opportunity to all its citizens.

Tennessee: Here, too, on the Deep South's border, a State is poised in hesitant balance over desegregation. The Supreme Court ruling brought tentative decisions from Knoxville, Chattanooga, and Nashville, to comply, while the Oak Ridge school district became the first in Tennessee to adopt full integration.

Now a political campaign year has revived the forces of prejudice against the moderate leadership of Gov. Frank Clement and Senators Kefauver and Gore. Under pressure, the Chattanooga school board says there will be no desegregation for probably 5 years, while a Federal court is prodding Nashville to adopt some plan within 7 months. The University of Tennessee's trustees are reconsidering a 4-year plan to desegregate their undergraduate schools. But Tennessee stays on middle ground.

Kentucky: At last report several score school districts had desegregated or decided

to do so in the land of the mint julep—including the capital of Frankfort. Louisville plans desegregation next fall on a flexible transfer basis. Public colleges and several private colleges are open without regard to race. And the legislature let an interposition resolution die quietly.

State Superintendent of Public Instruction Robert Martin said: "Integration has progressed without incident in Kentucky and without the mouthings of demagogues."

This record of six States shows varying degrees of progress and hesitancy toward public school integration, but it shows much more progress than hesitation.

Most important, Missouri and these five States touching upon it have one quality in common which is notably lacking in the Deep South. All of them have at least considered the possibility of integrating public schools and most have done so. None of them has attempted to say "No" to the law of the land. None has tried to bar the door against the requirements of democracy.

Five recalcitrant States of the Deep South cannot write the record on the Supreme Court's unanimous decision of 2 years ago. When the results of that decision are put in proper national perspective, the other 43 States may see that they are good.

[From the New York Times]

BRIEF SUMMARY OF SURVEY INTRODUCTION

A social revolution confronts the South. Dramatic adjustments are demanded by the Supreme Court order to end racial segregation in the schools. The problems present a challenge to the Nation as a whole.

I. States integrating

District of Columbia: The South watches Washington. There schools have been totally desegregated. But, while solving one problem, racial integration has created others—including a lowering of educational levels.

Kentucky: Without quibbling, Kentucky agreed to comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation order. Integration started last September in some districts. By next September it will be under way in all.

Maryland: Marylanders respect the law of the land and the Supreme Court's interpretation of that law. Despite some opposition, the State is moving faster toward integration than even its leaders claim.

Missouri: In every corner of Missouri, Negro pupils are now sitting at desks once reserved for whites only. Some form of integration has taken place in counties where 85 percent of the pupils live.

Oklahoma: Under the leadership of its Governor, Oklahoma has calmly taken the first steps toward integration. School districts in more than half the counties have desegregated to some degree.

West Virginia: School integration in parts of West Virginia began with anger and tears. But a happy ending is foreseen. Every county with Negro residents is making a start toward integration.

II. States divided or delaying

Arkansas: At the university level Arkansas was a pioneer in integration. But school desegregation lags. Only three districts have begun to integrate. Some say total integration is a distant prospect.

Delaware: Integration has cut a chasm across Delaware. The northern industrial one-third is moving gradually toward desegregation. The southern agricultural two-thirds is fighting back.

Florida: Segregation still reigns in Florida. But the racial temperature, like the State's weather, remains mild. Officials are calmly and carefully appraising the problems of desegregating the schools.

Louisiana: Nominally Deep South in its attitudes, Louisiana has nevertheless taken

significant steps toward desegregation. Led partly by the Catholic Church, the State has passed the "point of no return."

North Carolina: No integration has taken place in North Carolina, but there are signs of a willingness to start. Four cities have indicated they will comply with the Supreme Court's desegregation ruling.

Tennessee: Although divided against itself, Tennessee is headed hesitantly toward desegregation. Schools in some localities have complied or say they will comply with the Supreme Court's ruling.

Texas: Compared to Mississippi, "Texas is a kind of heaven" for Negro rights, says one Negro leader. West and south Texas are gradually integrating schools; east Texas will resist.

III. States resisting

Alabama: This State stands as a symbol of southern resistance to desegregation. Racial barriers seem to be rising. There is no race-mixing except in one Roman Catholic and one Negro institution.

Georgia: The State flatly refuses to integrate its schools, and is using every device to circumvent the Supreme Court's decision. Even here, however, legal segregation seems eventually doomed.

Mississippi: Among Southern States, Mississippi is probably furthest from integration. Yet, racial barriers are being buffeted. There are intimations that segregation may one day end.

South Carolina: Not a single Negro has been admitted to a white public school in South Carolina. Serious trouble might result from an immediate attempt to enforce desegregation. Yet, integration seems inevitable.

Virginia: In gentlemanly but determined fashion, the State is fighting integration, armed with the weapon of interposition. There has been no desegregation, and there are no immediate plans for any.

[From the Christian Science Monitor of June 23, 1956]

DESEGREGATION: THE SECOND YEAR

As time passes the shape of the American race problem conforms ever more closely to the dimensions foreseen by informed observers when the Supreme Court first ruled against law-required segregation in the public schools.

The Southern School News since shortly after the decision has been performing an invaluable service by reporting factually its impact on the States affected. The SSN has just published a summary of developments, State by State, during the second year following the ruling.

How do these summaries add up? Gradual desegregation, varying in speed and extent, by the border States: Delaware, Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Missouri, Oklahoma (and the District of Columbia). A somewhat mixed and moderate response in States such as North Carolina and Tennessee, in which mountain tradition has persisted (this was what might be called non-slavery before the Civil War), and in States such as Texas and Florida, whose populations contain a large infusion of northern and western elements.

As for the Deep South (Georgia, South Carolina, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana), opposition continues complete and resistance active. Virginia and Arkansas need special comment. For from a policy of limited compliance sentiment has shifted to resistance.

It should be noted, however, that steps are under way even in some resisting States to adapt to the decision by measures which, in theory at least, would give State support to voluntarily segregated as well as desegregated schooling.

The composite of social attitudes and actions this picture presents should not surprise anyone who understands the complexity and depth of the problem. It is keenly disappointing, of course, to those who have suffered most from the injustices which stem from the time when northern shipowners began transporting Negro slaves from Africa to work for southern planters. One reader of this newspaper (presumably a Negro) writes us:

"I do not understand your plea for time. * * * The Constitution dates from 1787. The Civil War closed around 1865. This prolonged disregard for individual human dignity should * * * cease * * * immediately if not sooner."

Freedom from slavery, of course. And it has. The right to vote, the right to equal protection of the law and equal justice before the courts, certainly. And this newspaper has and will continue to urge the speediest fulfillment of these rights.

But desegregation—in the schools, in other public places—involves not occasional contacts but association. And a pattern of association long hardened into custom and heavily overlaid with feelings of propriety and racial consciousness is not changed overnight. It cannot be remade by fiat or even by force.

The change will come gradually, first where the problems are least, until a moderating climate of opinion pervading the Nation fosters solutions everywhere by mutual accommodations through mutual consent.

In some States these changes are not going to come overnight, or even in a few years. All of us will grant the truth of the statement in the southern manifesto that the separate but equal doctrine "became a part of the life of the people of many of the States and confirmed their habits, customs, traditions, and way of life." William Graham Sumner's statement that "stateways cannot change folkways" is pertinent here.

In two of the cases that were before the Supreme Court, Briggs against Elliott from South Carolina, and Davis against Prince Edward County from Virginia, the district courts have held that the school boards were not in compliance. These cases are on their way back to the Supreme Court for further action. The Court's decision in those cases will give us further guides to carry out the constitutional principles.

A procedure of gradualism and moderation should be followed for school construction and President Eisenhower's statement at one of his press conferences affirms this. President Eisenhower said:

The Supreme Court * * * specifically provided that there be a gradual implementation and referred it back to the district courts so that it should be gradual.

He added that the Justices "recognize the deep roots of prejudice and attitudes that have been built up over the years in this problem." He then referred to the quote interim close quote policy decisions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the General Accounting Office pending quote final judicial determination close quote of the cases. Such final judicial determination will not be had until the Supreme Court has again passed on the Virginia and South Carolina cases referred to. An act of Congress disrupting this orderly and gradual process will destroy the firm

moderation that was implicit in the Supreme Court's decision.

But what happens if you put in the Powell amendment? It is a punitive amendment; it makes immediately effective what the Supreme Court said we should do gradually. It says to the South: "You must desegregate promptly"; whereas the Supreme Court said it should be done gradually.

What does the South get when you leave the Powell amendment out? The South buys some time.

What does the North and the people who are in favor of integration get? They get encouragement and a following of the Supreme Court decision, the North gets moderation.

The Powell amendment is not needed; it should not be put in this legislation. It is a repudiation of the Supreme Court decision if it is put in.

Yesterday my chairman mentioned the decision of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. I am going to ask that it be included in full in my remarks, but the purpose and intent of the policy is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to influence racial segregation in airport buildings.

The gentleman who wrote it testified in recent hearings that in announcing that policy the Department of Commerce was implementing the general executive policy not to use Federal funds in any way which might result in furthering the principle of segregation.

We asked him if that went further than the Supreme Court decision, and he said:

No, sir; the letter does not in my judgment go further than the Supreme Court decision went.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., April 6, 1956.

Airports Policy and Procedure, Memorandum No. 41.

To: All Holders of the Office of Airports Field Operations Manual.

From: Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

Subject: Airport building policy—segregation.

Programing standard G (3), as stated in the "Policies and Procedures" booklet, dated October 1, 1955, reads as follows:

"(3) No Federal-aid Airport Program funds will be made available for the development of separate facilities or space in an airport building when such facilities or space are designed for use now or in the future for separate racial groups."

The purpose and intent of the policy expressed in this programing standard is to prevent the use of Federal funds to further or to increase racial segregation in airport buildings. Under this policy, Federal-aid Airport Program funds will not be used in the construction or reconstruction of any areas of a building which are intended for use by separate racial groups.

It will, therefore, be required, prior to the issuance of a grant offer for any project involving a building, that the chief executive officer of the sponsor of each building project clearly state, in writing, whether or not it is the intent of the sponsor that all of the areas and facilities in the building will be available without regard to race, creed or color, and are intended to be operated on a non-segregated basis.

If not, it will be necessary that the written statement describe those areas and facilities within the building which are intended for segregated use.

If so, a simple written statement to this effect will suffice, unless the building will, upon completion, contain separate facilities, such as two or more waiting rooms, two or more dining areas, or two or more sets of sanitary facilities (a set consisting of one restroom for men and one restroom for women), etc. In this event, the sponsor's written statement shall, in addition, specifically point out the reason for providing such duplicate facilities and the intent of the sponsor in providing them.

If the written statement of the sponsor describes areas within the building that are intended for segregated use, such areas will not be eligible for, and will be excluded from, Federal-aid airport program participation. This will be accomplished by a special provision in the grant offer clearly specifying the ineligible space.

Where single facilities (one waiting room, one dining area or one set of sanitary facilities) are provided, from which it is intended that any person will be excluded on the basis of race, creed or color, such segregated areas will be excluded from the project.

Where duplicate facilities are provided, intended for segregated use, the areas involved in such duplicate facilities will be excluded from the project. For example:

(a) If separate waiting rooms for segregated use are provided, all waiting room areas will be excluded.

(b) If separate dining areas are provided for segregated use, all dining, kitchen, and related areas will be excluded.

(c) If separate sanitary facilities are provided for segregated use, all areas involving sanitary facilities will be excluded.

This policy will apply to all types of building construction work, including the construction of new buildings, the construction of additions to existing buildings, and the remodeling, alteration or repair of existing buildings, and will apply whether the work consists of the completion of a facility or its partial completion, such as the roughing-in of utilities.

The allowable costs of a building project, which include space and/or facilities excluded from Federal participation in the grant agreement, will be determined on the basis of an equitable distribution of the costs of the eligible and ineligible space and/or facilities. This, of course, should be taken into consideration in computing the maximum obligation of the Government as stated in the grant offer.

Any unusual cases which are not clearly covered by this policy will be presented to the Administrator for final determination.

C. J. LOWEN.

The issue in the Kelley bill is not a civil-rights issue, it is whether we are going to help build schools. If the school-aid bill is defeated in this Congress, the losers will be the boys and girls all over America. This classroom shortage has been with us too long already, and we have already sent some of our boys and girls out into life inadequately prepared for citizenship in a 20th-century world. Thomas Jefferson once said, "Young people come this way but once." Even if the Federal-aid bill is passed this year, it is going to take 2 to 3 years to get the classrooms built. To fail to pass a bill for Federal aid before adjournment of this Congress will be a grim gamble with the destiny of our most precious national resource, our boys and girls, white or red or black, in the South and East and West and North.

President Eisenhower has said, "The need of the American children for schools is right now, immediately, today." Let us fix our attention on the main objective, remove the roadblock of civil-

rights legislation from the educational bills, and enact legislation for Federal aid to schools this year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Montana has expired.

Mr. METCALF. I am sorry I did not get to answer the questions propounded to me by the gentleman from Alabama yesterday.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this time to express what I believe to be the views of the people of Dallas County, Tex., the district which I have the honor to represent. Regardless of political party, the majority of these people feel that Federal aid to education is entirely unnecessary and, as a matter of fact, is entirely contrary to the American system of education and government.

In order to state these views, I would like to analyze just the first two pages of H. R. 7535, the so-called Kelley bill cited as the School Construction Assistance Act of 1955. Let us just study these two pages and see what the bill says. Page 1, line 7, section 2, under findings and purpose of act:

The Congress finds that despite sustained and vigorous efforts by the States and local communities, which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level, there is still a serious national shortage of classrooms requiring emergency action on the part of the Federal Government.

Perhaps we have answered the problem, without going further in the bill, in this sentence which says, "which have increased current school construction to an unprecedented level"; 60,000 classrooms at a cost of over \$2 billion is the production for 1955 and the program is accelerating without Federal aid. Since 50,000 rooms are needed yearly for replacement purposes and growth of school-age population, we are already more than meeting requirements. Therefore, Federal aid is not necessary since the local communities within the States are doing the job already.

Further, is this a situation requiring "emergency action"? No, it is not. True, more classrooms are needed and the situation, even if critical, can be solved, as it is being solved, at the local level. This bill, on the contrary, will impede school construction. When Federal funds are in the offing, State and local efforts are bound to slow down or halt, awaiting help from the Federal grab bag.

Now, to continue, page 2, line 3:

The limited financial resources available to a number of communities are not adequate to support construction programs of sufficient size to eliminate their classroom shortages.

Now, just what are the financial resources? They are the aggregate tax moneys available from the pocketbooks in any given area. True, these resources are limited, but they certainly are not increased by Federal handout, which, of course, comes from these same pocketbooks. As a matter of fact, the available money is decreased as Government deducts a sizable chunk in the round trip from pocketbook to Washington and re-

turn to the community level. For this reason, again, schools should be financed at the local level. Perhaps we should dwell on the word "limited" in this sentence and realize there is a limit to what we can tax our people; that there is a limit to Federal debt. For that matter, it is well to remember that the Federal debt is now greater than the combined debts of localities, cities, States, and the rest of the world. Is this reason to presume financial help is more sensible from the Federal Government than from local sources?

Now, to continue, line 6:

Other communities, in their efforts to apply their potential resources to their needs, are confronted with restrictive debt and tax limits, an inability to borrow the necessary funds at reasonable rates, and other obstacles.

It might be well for us to examine these restrictive debt and tax limitations because we might find they were imposed by the people for sound reasons, the same fiscal reasons which should prompt the Federal Government from extending its debt, but whatever the restrictive local debt and tax limitation, these problems should be solved by these communities who know their situation and financial needs without the stimulus of a heavily indebted Federal Government prompting them to exceed existing limitation.

It seems only commonsense that the communities know best about solving their financial problems along with school construction. In fact, this bill might even penalize those communities that have indebted themselves more heavily in the positive effort of solving the educational problem as they saw fit. Here is another instance of where the Federal law may well subsidize a lack of effort rather than encourage it.

While the Congress recognizes that responsibility for providing adequate school facilities lies primarily with the States and local communities, the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving these pressing problems.

Now, just what does this mean—that up is down and black is white, that we teach a child to save while giving him money? That local effort is aided by Federal control? How is it possible that we in Congress can believe, based on experience, other than Federal money means Federal control? This bill itself proves it, for hereafter follows 29 pages of detailed instructions controlling the Federal help that is to be extended. In fact, the Federal Government must control its expenditures or the Federal Government's obligation to protect the taxpayers' money is violated. How, then, realizing this fact, can we justify this sentence? Now, as to the national interest, as herein mentioned, what is this national interest? Is there some national interest in our children greater and superseding to the interest of parents and local communities in their young people? Of course not. Big Federal Government is entirely impersonal. There is no national interest, as such, but only the composite of the local communities. Only in the school district can there be immediate and specific in-

terest in educational problems. This argument, like all others affecting big centralized Government, is in direct conflict with the 10th amendment of the Constitution and States rights. Where are the Congressmen who really believe in States rights now?

As to the alternative programs mentioned, beginning in line 16, number (1), permitting grants to communities is simply the modern equivalent of "Rob Peter to pay Paul." Federal grants, if not unconstitutional, are inherently wrong when superimposed on a society where the people, the communities, the States can look after themselves—at least under our traditional system of Government checks and balances wherein sovereign States are recognized. The grant-in-aid will simply cause our States to compete with each other to secure as large a share of the Federal handout as possible in self-protection, remembering their large Federal tax contributions.

Line 19 to the end of the page suggests two proposals: one, the purchase of bonds, and the other, credit assistance to States, wherein the Federal Government becomes liable for all obligations to be incurred by the communities. If we reflect that in addition to the \$278 billion of national debt there is an additional \$240-odd billion of contingent Federal liabilities, we might realize that the Federal Government is not itself such a good credit risk, and we might not be so quick to add the contingent liability of \$6 billion of credit assistance in this bill.

These remarks are directed just at the first 2 pages of the 29-page Kelley bill. Time does not permit a further study of the many and varied types of Federal control herein laid down to be imposed on our States and communities. There is some question whether it is possible to even understand the language of the bill. Perhaps we are not supposed to understand but accept once again blindly a huge Federal program at the expense of traditional States rights.

Is this just a temporary program to last until 1960, as we are told, to alleviate the temporary critical classroom shortage? Of course not. Whoever heard of the Federal Government backing off a program once it has started? Rather, it mushrooms in growth, so let us not delude ourselves.

Our decision in this aid-to-education bill is simply a matter of whether we want political domination of our schools in the future or not. With the passage of this bill, education will enter full-fledged into the arena of politics, where decisions are made by political expediency and not on principle. Is this the heritage of our children? I pray that it is not.

Federal aid means Federal control. It cannot be otherwise. Yet the advocates of the bill blandly assure us that such is not the case when even they must know that Federal control inevitably follows the expenditure of Federal money. Then, why are the proponents of this bill deluding themselves? I do not know. I only suspect that we Americans are now no longer fighting but are embracing the principles of socialism. For our well-educated, intelligent Members of Congress to fail to see the dangers inherent

in this course of action is regrettable indeed.

At this point, I would like to close with a letter which I directed to our beloved President which quotes him and through using his own logic and outlook defeats, at least to my satisfaction, the principle of Federal aid to education:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., December 6, 1955.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: It is my belief that the educational conference just concluded is not indicative of the grassroots opinion of the citizens of our country. There were too many delegates connected with education professionally—and a system employed wherein no votes were taken to get the majority view.

Whatever the reason, I am certain that Federal aid to education is not desired by the majority of Dallas County citizens for the same reasons you outlined so clearly in your congressional message last year.

"For unless education continues to be free—free in its response to local community needs, free from any suggestion of political domination, and free from impediments to the pursuit of knowledge by teachers and students—it will cease to serve the purpose of free men."

Education would not be free from political domination, or Government control in some form, once Federal funds are used. Citizens expect a fiscally responsible Government to oversee expenditures, so controls would be mandatory. Experience in other Government programs has shown that Government control follows financial aid. No one, to my knowledge, contradicts this time-tested fact. Those who promise that no Federal control will accompany Federal funds, it seems to me, are indulging in wishful thinking.

It is my hope that you will not hastily adopt the conference findings as a basis for requested legislation, but in view of the criticisms recognize that we still need a truly grassroots digest of opinion. As one suggestion, would it not be sensible to secure the views of the delegates in writing, together with their relationship with education?

If the principle is wrong, then any amount of Federal aid is wrong; even a small amount would be "a foot in the door" and would be followed by more. To quote you once again:

"Federal aid in a form that tends to lead to Federal control of our schools could cripple education for freedom. In no form can it ever approach the mighty effectiveness of an aroused people."

As aroused people, we can do this job at the local and State level; otherwise, we will lose freedom of education, jeopardizing our children's and the Nation's future, a result certainly not sought by a majority of grass-root Americans.

With warm personal regards,
Respectfully,

BRUCE ALGER.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES].

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks immediately following those of the gentleman from Arizona.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, this bill we have before us for consideration has been widely discussed

and I do not see that I can add anything very important to what has been said, but I would like to address myself for a moment to the question which the gentleman from Georgia asked of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF] concerning the effect of this bill insofar as the States which practice segregation in the schools are concerned.

The question, as I recall, was to the point that no matter what happens as to the Powell amendment, that very likely the States that practice segregation would not receive funds under this bill. I merely would like to point out to the House that that may well be the situation, but it does not necessarily have to be the situation. I take the analogy of the federally impacted school districts and the aid to those districts which was given under Public Laws 815 and 874. There has been no attempt, as far as I know, on the part of the administration or anybody else since the famous Supreme Court decision in Brown against Board of Education to cut off any of the money which was appropriated under the authorization of those public laws to schools because such schools practiced segregation. I cannot say that such a movement may not be made in the future, but I can say that I do not believe the possibility that that might occur is any good reason to oppose this legislation.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman. I feel that whether or not the Powell amendment, which requires prompt and immediate desegregation, is put in this legislation, the administration and the courts in following out the implementing decision of the Supreme Court for gradual and moderate desegregation will not bring about any change in our present system during the life of this bill.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman will also agree with me, as he mentioned, if this bill passes without the Powell amendment, in those States which have not been able to desegregate, very likely before there is any attempt to cut them out from participation in this bill there may be other developments or there may be integration in some of the States which now practice desegregation. Then this particular bug-a-boo should be laid at rest and anybody who opposes this bill on the basis that his State or her State will definitely not receive money will realize, that such is not necessarily the situation.

Mr. Chairman, yesterday there was a very fine presentation made by the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, a man for whom I have the greatest respect and greatest amount of affection. However, the presentation was aimed largely at the so-called Federal control which might come from the enactment of a bill such as this. Federal control, if it will exist, must exist as the result of the State planning provisions found in section 103, pages 3 to 6, inclusive.

I would like to go through the provisions of that particular section very briefly with the Members, to see what

we require from the States in the way of a State plan before the States are eligible to receive money under this bill.

Subsection 1 provides that the State educational agency shall be the sole agency for administering the plan. Of course, an educational agency is required as a go-between between the Office of Education and the school district itself. We do not want this law to be passed in such a way that the Federal Government or the Office of Education will find it necessary to deal directly with school districts. We want the States to be in this picture; we want the States to have the authority to say how this plan will be administered in the States in which it might operate. So we have set up as a go-between the State educational agency.

In subsection 2 it is stated that the money which goes to the States under this bill will go for the further construction of schools. Of course, it will go for the construction of schools. This bill is for school construction. I cannot see anything very wrong with that.

Subsection 3, which is a long subsection, sets forth the principles on which the States will determine the priorities for distribution of this money when it is received by the States. It provides that the States will first favor those school districts which have made efforts commensurate with their economic resources and which are unable solely because of lack of such resources to finance available school facilities.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. But who determines that?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The State determines that. The only thing that the State has to do is to set up a plan which sets forth the criteria under which it will make the determination. Then the State agency itself determines which school district gets the money and which does not.

Now then, as to subsection 4, it merely provides for such fiscal-control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State under this title. In other words, the State plan will set forth the procedures which will be used. It does not say the Office of Education will set forth procedures. It says that the State plan will set forth the procedures.

Subsection 5 provides that a hearing may be had by any school district that feels that it is aggrieved by the allotments made under this act by the State. I do not think anybody would quarrel with the right of any school district to have such a hearing if it feels it has been unfairly treated.

Subsection 6 has to do with building standards. We are not going to tell anybody how to build schools, but we do want the school plan to include the criteria under which schools shall be constructed.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I understood you to say you are not telling the States how to build schools, but you are telling the States what wages to pay if you leave it to the Secretary of Labor to fix the prevailing wage.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I agree with the gentleman. That is what the Davis-Bacon Act provides. If the gentleman wants to talk about it now, I will be happy to. Does the gentleman have any further questions?

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. No. But I cannot see the justice of letting the Secretary of Labor here in Washington fix the prevailing wage and requiring the people of that community to pay that wage and forcing people to belong to the union, even though they pay part of the bill. I cannot see the justice of that.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The Davis-Bacon Act says that builders shall pay the prevailing wage in the community and that those wages shall be paid on any construction job. It does not require union membership.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I do not understand that to be the situation. The Davis-Bacon Act provides for the fixing of the prevailing wage by the Secretary of Labor here, does it not?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. All right. But when you get down into the district and you want to construct a school, then the agency has nothing more to say about wages, and under the present situation you cannot get work on that job until you get the consent of the union and pay dues. Now, that is a practical situation. There is nothing in the law about it, but that is what exists. So the fellow that pays the bill cannot get the job.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I know that is not the situation in my particular State. If it is in the gentleman's State, then I would certainly be down at the Department of Labor and doing what I could about it as a Member of the Congress, because the law is not being enforced as it was written.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. You say it does not prevail in your district. Do you mean by that that anybody can work on these projects without belonging to the union?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I certainly do.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Thank God you live in a good community where you can, but up in our particular territory, where Walter Reuther and Jimmy Hoffa are in control, you have to join the union and pay dues. That is a supertax now. Maybe you ought to come up and learn about it, because it is vicious and wicked.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. From what the gentleman says, I am very happy to live in Arizona.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They will come out there, too. Do not worry. They will move in as soon as they make up their minds to move out. They are up in Cincinnati now, trying to take over.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. They are still a long way off.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. But with the modern methods of transportation, they will get there overnight.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The seventh subsection provides for reports. In other words, it becomes rather important for the Commissioner of Education, as the coordinator of the whole plan, to have some idea as to the problems which are being met in the various States in the operation of this plan.

I would like to point out, on line 13, page 5, that these reports will be such as are reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I have just been advised by the distinguished gentleman from the West and by the ranking minority Member that in your State you have a right-to-work law, and I understand it is enforced. Is that true?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. That is correct.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Well, do you charge anything for establishing residence out there?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. No, sir. We take all immigrants. We would be glad to have even Members of the Congress if they wish to come; that is, if they give up their seats and do not have any further political aspirations.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. What about giving up any rights to a pension which we so generously voted for ourselves?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. We do not seek indigent immigrants to our State, so we would like to have the gentleman keep his pension.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, just this further observation, if the gentleman will permit. While the gentleman feels good over this situation now, the Supreme Court has not passed on that particular statute yet, has it?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Yes; the Supreme Court has upheld our right-to-work law.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. They upheld the one in Virginia, but you never can tell when they are going to change their minds.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I have no quarrel with the last statement of the gentleman.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. I want to thank the gentleman if I have found someone to agree with me on one thing.

In the end the gentleman will find that he is right, if he agrees.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Subparagraph 7 merely calls for reports. I was very much interested in the wording of this, because those of you who were here when we debated the library extension bill will recall that this bill called for reports and the reports had no qualifying language. In other words, almost any kind of report could have been called for and if the report was not submitted as the Commissioner thought it should be submitted, then funds could have been cut off. We corrected this by amendment. We did not want this to happen in this bill, and therefore we have this wording in here "as is reasonably necessary." We also have, further on, a provision for judicial review. In other

words, if any State feels that the Commissioner has not treated it right, then it may go into the courts and present its grievance in the Federal Court of the United States.

It is also true, that if the Commissioner asked for any unreasonable reports and the State refused to give the reports and for that reason the Commissioner cut off funds, the State could certainly take that particular matter to the courts and have the Federal courts in the district in which the capital of the State is located adjudicate that particular point.

This is all that was required of the State as far as a plan is concerned. Bear in mind it is a plan. On line 16, page 5, it is stated that the Commissioner shall approve—not may approve but shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a). I have read the provisions of subsection (a). I do not think there is anything in this State plan which is dangerous. I do not think there is anything here which would require any State—your State or my State—to give up any sovereignty over its people or its school system. I do not think there is anything in here which would require any local educational agency to sell its soul for a mess of pottage in order to build schools.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. May I assume from the gentleman's remarks that he feels that the passage of H. R. 7535 will not ultimately result in Federal control of our school system?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I will say to the gentleman from Alabama, if I felt that there was the slightest danger that the passage of this bill would result in any control whatsoever by the Federal Government over our school systems, I would be against it and I would have voted against it in committee and would have done my very best to keep it from coming to this floor.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield further.

Mr. SELDEN. In the event this measure is enacted into law, and in the gentleman's opinion, would it be possible for an organization or a group opposed to segregation to obtain an injunction that would prevent these funds from being spent in any State which now practices segregation in its public-school system?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. There is nothing in the bill which provides that that can be done; but I would say in all candor to the gentleman that although I know of no precedent for such an injunction, I could not state positively that such an action might not be brought.

Mr. SELDEN. Then, can I gather from the gentleman's statement that, in his opinion, there is a possibility that funds authorized under this bill will be denied States which practice segregation in their public-school system even if the Powell amendment is defeated?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman knows full well that the wheels of justice grind slowly, and I would say

that even if such an action can be brought, before such a case could progress from the Federal district court to the Supreme Court, many months and possibly years could be consumed. Whereas, if the Powell amendment is passed, immediately after the passage of the bill with the Powell amendment in it, the States which practice segregation would not be eligible for funds.

Mr. SELDEN. The gentleman feels, though, that the ultimate results would be the same?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am not going to try to guess what the Supreme Court decision would be. I have said to the gentleman, that an action possibly would lie under this bill to enjoin payment to States which have segregated schools. As to the results, I would not hazard a guess.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. I thank the gentleman for yielding, because I promised to answer this series of questions yesterday when they were propounded by the gentleman from Alabama.

I agree that there is a possibility of an injunction by any group or any individual. In addition to that, of course, there is a provision of statute, title 42, section 1983, that authorizes a civil action on deprivation of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. However, it would be a matter of the burden of proof, it seems to me, to show that the State has not complied with the various provisions that are laid down in implementing the decision of the Court, and had not made a start with deliberate speed so far as the physical condition of the plant, school transportation, personnel, and all the things enumerated are concerned. As the gentleman says, in some of the areas where segregation has been a way of life for many years, it would take longer than it would in some of the border States.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Would the gentleman agree with me that you might have certain very hard cases under this? You might have a case brought concerning payment to a State in which there was partial integration and partial segregation. In such a situation under this bill I would think the Supreme Court might have a great deal of difficulty in coming to a decision.

Mr. METCALF. I would say that under the implementing decision that would be enough to carry out the burden of proof of moderation, a gradual start with deliberate speed.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. In other words, if the same philosophy that was set forth in Brown against Board of Education is followed through, in such event you might have all sorts of cases going over all four points of the compass.

Mr. METCALF. Some of the border States that have started to segregate would certainly be entitled to get money under this bill and would have a defense in the case of an injunction such as the gentleman mentions.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. Does the gentleman know of any statute presently existing or any authority which would permit a suit against a Federal official to enjoin that Federal official from paying out Federal funds without any reason?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I know of no such statute. I do not know it cannot be done now. The law has changed much in the last few years.

Mr. MURRAY of Illinois. May I suggest to the gentleman that I do not know of any statute which permits a citizen to enjoin a Federal official from the disbursement of Federal funds. I call to his attention that the statute to which the gentleman referred on civil rights is a statute directed against State officials and has absolutely no application to Federal officials.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. The gentleman from Montana alluded to the statute.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I am interested in the matter of the time element, as has been suggested in the various speeches of the last few minutes. Do I correctly understand that there would be any longer period before payment could be withheld under the bill without the Powell amendment? Would not injunction proceedings immediately start the withholding of the money?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that she has been listening to lawyers' talk. We are merely conjecturing as to how long it would take to get a case through the courts.

Mrs. CHURCH. I generally understand when lawyers talk. But, I am wondering about the difference in timing, and I am sincere about it. I had inferred from the gentleman's remarks, and they have been excellent, sir, and from the remarks by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. METCALF], that there would be more delay in possible withholding of funds, without the Powell amendment. I cannot see how that would be the case. It would be my untutored opinion that once a suit were started, payment of money would automatically cease; is that or is that not so?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. If a suit could be brought for injunctive relief and a temporary injunction was granted, the gentleman is correct. It depends entirely upon how the suit is begun and how it is prosecuted.

Mrs. CHURCH. So it would be a mere faint hope that is being held out here to those who do not want to integrate and who feel it would be easier to continue segregation without the Powell amendment. Is that not so?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I understand the gentleman's point. But, the point that the gentleman from Montana and I are trying to make is that there is a chance if this bill is passed without the Powell amendment that funds will be paid to the States to build schools

which are so much required. If the bill is passed with the Powell amendment, then certain States almost certainly will not get money under the bill.

Mrs. CHURCH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mr. VELDE. I compliment the gentleman for his very fine statement. I believe the gentleman heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] read a list of those States where the State would pay in more money in taxes than it would be receiving in school-construction funds. I noticed that the State of Arizona was among them. I just would like to ask the gentleman how he explains to his taxpayers why he is favorable to that type of bill. I have a similar situation in Illinois.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I dislike to correct my good friend, the gentleman from Illinois, but the State of Arizona is on the other side of the ledger, which makes it, perhaps, easier for me to do what I am doing today, but I must also inform him that I would still be doing what I am doing even if it were the other way around.

Mr. VELDE. I am sorry I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mrs. BLITCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I yield.

Mrs. BLITCH. Would the gentleman permit the gentlewoman from Georgia to take all of the legal language and lawyer's talk that the gentleman is using and just put it in a few simple words that all of us can understand and say that it is the difference between killing us quickly and killing us slowly?

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I assure the gentlewoman that the gentleman from Arizona has no desire to kill anyone. All I want to do is to build schools for children of all races and creeds, and to build them as rapidly as possible, and I want to build them in all the 48 States.

Mr. WITHROW. Mr. Chairman, findings from surveys by reputable authorities show clearly that only by an investment of substantial proportions in education can our States in this Nation hope to have the trained personnel necessary to operate successfully in our age. Obviously, the money must come from some tax source, and I know that the people back home in Wisconsin are looking for some relief from the direct property tax for financing schools which has become almost unbearable in some of our less favored communities.

The finance section of the Wisconsin White House Conference report shows that we are about an average State—putting into the pot through Federal withholding and other taxes about what would be returned to our State. But I should like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the fact that this bill does two very significant things for education in Wisconsin:

First. It returns at least a small portion of Federal taxes for use of a very important State function, and in a truer sense, a local school district function—the building of sorely needed school buildings; and

Second. It makes this money available under a plan promulgated by our State Department of Public Instruction and approved by the United States Commissioner of Education.

With regard to its distribution within my State, I am satisfied that our State Department of Public Instruction will actually use the rather meager amount which would be allotted to Wisconsin—meager in relation to the total cost of education in the State—to very good advantage. Ours is one of the States that provides no State support whatsoever for school building construction.

This federally collected money could therefore be available to assist needy districts to provide new buildings and do remodeling of obsolescent buildings so that it would definitely benefit the health and welfare of children in underprivileged areas of our own State.

Whereas Wisconsin laws now provide equalization aid to level out severe tax overloads for operating costs only, this money from Federal sources could, and I am sure would, be used to equalize opportunity for proper school housing within our State. And it is one of the strong points of this measure that permits every State to develop its own plan to use this Federal assistance to the best advantage for school housing.

Wisconsin is in the forefront of States in that it has, by recent constitutional amendment, removed artificial borrowing limitations on its school districts. Each district may now bond itself for 5 percent of its State equalized valuation. But the State superintendent of schools informs me that, in the spite of this high ceiling on borrowing for school construction, a recent survey reveals that there are still 9 cities in our State that cannot finance the school buildings they need. And I am certain there must be dozens of such school districts centering in villages and rural hamlets, because the Wisconsin White House conference report—pages 7 and 8, on finance—shows that the State equalized valuation back of each pupil varies from \$6,700 in Forest County to \$39,700 in Ozaukee County. But the school district is the unit that bears the load for buildings—and here the variation in ability ranges from less than \$4,000 per pupil in property valuation to over \$80,000—1 to 20.

This bill then would provide a vehicle to do two things for our State:

First, show that Congress is interested in some of the severe problems that face our local school districts in providing proper school housing for this avalanche of children; and, second, provide some tangible means to more nearly equal school housing facilities where most needed, and therefore, because it provides this means of equalizing opportunity for children and relieving excessive property tax burdens in the poorer areas of my own State. I am happy to support this bill and urge my associates to do likewise.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BAILEY].

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], that he may insert his

remarks on this legislation immediately following my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mrs. PFOST].

Mrs. PFOST. Mr. Chairman, this is a significant day in House history. We have before us the first school construction bill to be cleared by a committee of the Congress. If ever a committee should be complimented on a fine job—a job well done—this is the day to do it.

I am convinced, Mr. Chairman, that the vast majority of the American people want a school construction bill passed—and they want it passed immediately. It is up to us to get through a measure that is acceptable to as many of them as possible. The Nation cannot wait any longer for additional schools.

Our present school enrollment is about 29 million. There are no regular classrooms for thousands of schoolchildren. Thousands of others study in facilities that are substandard and even dangerous to life and health.

This fall another million 6-year-olds will set out on their big adventure. When the babies born in the past 5 record-breaking years are ready for school, enrollment will be close to 35 millions. By 1960 there will be 170 children for every 100 we now have.

Faced with such galloping gains, school officials all over the country have stated frankly that the only way they can catch up on school construction is for the Federal Government to help the States. Local district after local district has bonded itself to statutory and constitutional debt limits and still found itself unable to meet the increased needs for school buildings.

We, in Idaho, have been making a greater than average effort to keep a roof over the heads of our schoolchildren. We spend a larger percent of our individual incomes than most States on schools. We also pay our teachers somewhat more than the national average, and still their salaries are vastly inadequate.

Idaho will need about \$60 million for school buildings between now and 1960—and that is a big sum in a small State. The bill before us would give Idaho about \$7 million. Add to this the provisions for bonding and loans provided in titles II and III of this bill, and the outlook brightens considerably.

Idahoans are overwhelmingly in favor of this bill. The propriety of Federal aid for school construction is not a compelling issue there. I believe most people in Idaho support local control of schools, just as do most people elsewhere. But very few of them feel that Federal aid for school construction will in any way violate that long-standing principle.

Mr. Chairman, the eyes of the mothers and fathers of America are on the House of Representatives today. What happens here is also being watched with crisp attention by school board members, school superintendents, supervisors, principals, teachers, and many, many other Americans in all walks of life and of all ages.

We must find a satisfactory solution to the problems of integration and segregation that have so long held up consideration of this legislation. We must pass a school construction bill without further delay.

I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding this time to me.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN], who addressed the House earlier, has left the floor. I do feel I would be remiss in my duty if I failed to correct in the RECORD some misstatements that the gentleman made to the House.

The gentleman said that New York does not need this Federal aid. He also said that nobody from the State of New York appeared before the committee at the hearings to lay the situation in the State of New York before the committee.

I call attention to page 823 of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor on this legislation, that a member of the committee from New York, Mr. ZELENKO, inquired of the Governor of the State of New York his position on this legislation.

I want to read a telegram from Governor Harriman, addressed to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ZELENKO], a member of the committee. It is in the hearings at page 823:

HON. HERBERT ZELENKO,

House of Representatives:

I am happy to respond to your request for a statement of New York State's interest in Federal aid for school construction to be submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. We do not have in New York State adequate classroom space for our present school population and the situation is going to become more rather than less acute in the next few years.

In addition, we in New York State believe that we stand to gain by improvements in the educational standards of the entire country's school system. Accordingly, I will be obliged if you would advise the committee that I am strongly in favor of Federal aid for school construction to be equitably distributed. I am not in favor of the administration's proposed program in this field because it will not be of assistance to New York State, nor will it substantially contribute to a national solution.

AVERELL HARRIMAN.

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BAILEY. The gentleman advised me he could not yield. I cannot yield to him. I believe in reciprocity of courtesy. I did not get it and I am not going to yield.

The United Parents Association of New York submitted testimony in the hearings to this effect, and I am going to read briefly:

This year the school budget reached \$100 million. Despite these huge outlays we cannot meet our needs. Estimates for the next 5 years indicate that if we are to meet the emergency in time for children now in school, and about to enter school, there must be help from other echelons of government.

That is from the city of New York.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in urging favorable action on H. R. 7535—the pending bill—I shall preface my remarks with a quotation from the Bible. I call my colleague's attention to the 40th verse of

the 25th chapter from the Scripture as recorded by St. Matthew, and I quote:

And the King shall answer and say unto them, Verily I say unto you, inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren, ye have done it unto me.

The Holy Scriptures are replete with exhortations that we care for and properly train our children.

We, Members of Congress, have for the past several weeks and even months been devoting time, energy, and the taxpayers' money to material things. Back of this effort has been the profit angle and the desire to boost business and to stabilize our own and international economy.

Today we are faced with a more basic problem, and I refer to our youth who will be the citizens of tomorrow.

Our America, if it is to survive in this troubled world, must get back to the fundamentals on which the Republic stands. No nation is greater than the people who compose it. Democracy cannot thrive on ignorance. Its citizenry must be an educated citizenry.

Good schools are good business—as an investment, there is no better than our young people. A good education is the best heritage we can leave them.

The issue we face today is quite controversial. There are some who say the Federal Government should stay out of the field of local education.

Chief among the opponents is the United States Chamber of Commerce. They have a pocketbook approach. Primarily, they are interested in putting a dollar sign on this proposal of Federal grants-in-aid to help State and local school boards catch up on the shortage of school classrooms. They lose sight of the program's broader and humanitarian aspects. They can see no immediate profits; their attitude reflects the materialistic viewpoint.

Only a few days ago the Congress approved and sent to the President what we boastfully called the greatest construction program in the history of the world. We are going to spend some \$33 billion on our Nation's highways. Why? Because it is good business. The Farm Bureau, the American Legion, and other satellites of the chamber of commerce approve. They, too, can see the profit angle in better transportation. When we want to do something for our Nation's greatest asset, our boys and girls, they put on their dark glasses and conjure out of thin air such worn-out slogans as "creeping socialism" and "encroachment on States' rights."

We think nothing of appropriating millions of dollars of American taxpayers' money to build school facilities in foreign countries, from Ethiopia to Pakistan, and from Patagonia to Iceland. It occurs to me that we could best serve America by making our future as a nation more secure by acting now to meet a situation that is rapidly developing into a national disgrace.

Let me briefly sketch for you the situation we propose to eliminate by the passage of H. R. 7535:

As the author of Public Law 815 in 1950, I conducted hearings throughout the country. I was amazed and appalled by the situation that those hearings brought forth, and reports and legisla-

tion were prepared by my subcommittee for aid to the impacted school districts.

The national school facilities survey was authorized in 1950 by title I of Public Law 815, 81st Congress. Progress reports of the survey were published in 1952-53. Most of the data for the final long-range planning report were gathered by the States in 1954 and the final report, signed by Samuel M. Brownell, United States Commissioner of Education, was released in March 1956.

The report known as the Long Range Planning Phase of the School Facilities Survey concludes that 476,000 classrooms should be built during the 5-year period 1954 to 1959. To build 476,000 classrooms in 5 years will require building at a rate of 95,000 per year. In 1953-54 we built 55,000 classrooms; in 1954-55 we built 60,000 classrooms; the Health, Education, and Welfare Department has reports from the States indicating that 67,000 classrooms would be completed for use in 1955-56.

But what about the 95,000 that must be constructed if we are to meet the increasing enrollment and take care of the obsolescent classrooms? In 1952 there were 995,000 school classrooms in the entire United States. One hundred and ninety-one thousand of those classrooms were over 30 years old and they will need to be abandoned; they are evidently obsolescent.

We should build 476,000 classrooms in the 5-year period 1954-59 instead of the 300,000 which would be built if construction continues at the present rate. This means that an average of 35,000 classrooms each year for 5 years should be built in addition to what is already being constructed; and that is the object of this program, this legislation.

The total cost of meeting our school building needs by 1959 will be \$16 billion. This averages to \$3.2 billion a year. Present construction amounts to \$2.5 billion a year. The problem is to close the gap between a required expenditure of \$3.2 billion and actual expenditures of \$2.5 billion.

And if we clear this legislation and provide \$400 million to be matched by an equal amount of \$400 million from States and local school districts we will have practically reached that goal of spending \$3.2 billion which will permit us to build 95,000 classrooms.

The problem is complicated by the fact that 1 out of every 6 school districts—I would like for my colleagues to get this significant statement—the problem is complicated by the fact that 1 out of every 6 school districts covered by the survey will not be able to construct the schools it needs unless it finds new sources of money or increased help from outside the district. These districts need to build \$11 billion worth of schools by 1959.

In connection with those same districts, out of a total of forty-some thousand districts in the Nation, something like 7,000 cannot meet their construction needs. They have \$4 billion of resources available and they need \$11 billion. The \$7 billion shortage in those 7,000 school districts would account for 212,000 of the 475,000 classrooms. So you see, despite what the gentleman from New York said,

we do have a serious national situation affecting our schools and some of it is right in his own State of New York.

BIRTH RATES IN RECENT YEARS

The great increase in birth rate is obviously the greatest single factor producing our classroom shortage. Almost 50 percent more children were born in 1954 than in 1944, 10 years earlier, as indicated by the following portion of table B on page 6 of the School Facilities Survey:

Year:	Number of live births
1944.....	2,939,000
1945.....	2,858,000
1946.....	3,411,000
1947.....	3,817,000
1948.....	3,637,000
1949.....	3,649,000
1950.....	3,632,000
1951.....	3,823,000
1952.....	3,913,000
1953.....	3,971,000
1954.....	4,100,000

Are you aware that means that approximately 1,400,000 schoolchildren will enter school in September for the first time? Are you aware of the fact that it will take 50,000 classrooms to meet that increased enrollment, to say nothing about the shortage we have been talking about and worrying about? Yet they tell you there is no problem in the Nation. The gentleman from New York is a mouthpiece for the United States Chamber of Commerce, an organization that is against everything that does not have a dollar interest attached to it. We have got to get away from this materialistic viewpoint and get back to the humanitarian angle in this piece of legislation if nowhere else.

Now, let us talk about the school enrollment.

ENROLLMENTS

Increased birth rates mean enlarged enrollments all along the line through 12 years of schooling.

During the school year just ended (1955-56) 32 million pupils were enrolled in our elementary and secondary schools. This was approximately 1.4 million more children than were enrolled in the previous year. The children who will enter school in September 1956, 1957, 1958, and 1959 have already been born. Enrollments for these years can, therefore, be predicted with great accuracy. United States Office of Education enrollment estimates are as follows:

1955-56.....	32,026,000
1956-57.....	33,350,000
1957-58.....	34,679,000
1958-59.....	36,054,000
1959-60.....	37,300,000

The 37.3 million figure for 1960 represents a 50 percent increase over the enrollments of 1949-50.

THE SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION BACKLOG

The status phase report of the school facilities survey published in 1953 indicated the existence of a backlog of 312,000 classrooms needed in September 1952. More than half of this backlog consisted of classrooms needed to replace obsolete or unsafe buildings. The other half represented classrooms needed to relieve overcrowding and to accommodate the enrollment increase from the previous year.

Overcrowding: In January 1956 the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that 2,250,000 pupils were enrolled in excess of the normal capacity of public school buildings. These children were being accommodated by increasing class sizes, by use of double sessions, or by placing them in buildings not intended for school use. Churches, lodge halls, garages, and warehouses were being pressed into service. The reports from the States estimated that 80,000 classrooms should be built to take care

of pupils enrolled in excess of normal capacity.

Obsolescence: The 1952 status phase survey showed that 47 percent of the school buildings in use at that time were over 30 years old. The judgment that a building is obsolete or unfitted for school purposes is one that varies from State to State and from district to district. Generally speaking, a building more than 30 years old requires more to be spent on it for maintenance and repair or necessary remodeling than a newer building.

Because standards of building fitness vary so widely, the Office of Education has suggested a conservative figure for classroom replacement over the 5 years ending in September 1959. The rate is 36,000 classrooms a year, a total of 180,000 classrooms. On this basis the life of a classroom is 28 years at the end of which it is ready for replacement or extensive—and expensive—remodeling. The rate of obsolescence will vary from State to State depending on climatic and other local conditions.

TABLE J.—Estimated capital outlay of projected plans for meeting school plant needs by 1959-60: Totals for States, and for administrative units with inadequate applicable capital outlay resources, within the law and customary practice in the respective States at the time of the survey

[Financial data in thousands]

For entire State							For administrative units with inadequate applicable capital outlay resources (within the limitations of law and customary practice)						
State	Number of administrative units	Costs	Number of such units	Costs	Applicable capital outlay resources	Computed deficits	State	Number of administrative units	Costs	Number of such units	Costs	Applicable capital outlay resources	Computed deficits
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Alabama.....	108	\$350,411	108	\$350,411	\$16,337	\$334,074	New Hampshire ¹	234	\$45,326	26	\$31,946	\$19,623	\$12,323
Arizona.....	158	117,004	62	63,651	39,222	24,429	New Jersey.....	546	506,659	395	440,120	50	440,120
Arkansas.....	423	198,391	375	185,233	56,319	128,914	New Mexico ¹	104	123,073	73	115,721	1,442	114,279
California.....	2,018	2,116,924	146	1,264,665	645,717	618,948	North Carolina.....	174	303,693	155	259,119	100,002	159,117
Colorado.....	1,151	171,618	51	44,636	30,972	13,664	Oklahoma.....	1,845	211,142	1,014	205,137	60,752	144,385
Connecticut.....	174	261,449	83	170,484	77,581	92,903	Oregon.....	766	104,233	71	23,930	12,881	11,049
Florida.....	67	326,937	38	131,422	71,310	60,112	Pennsylvania.....	2,505	871,125	1,989	798,963	165,338	633,625
Georgia.....	200	492,550	187	426,338	244,796	181,542	Rhode Island.....	39	64,334	31	63,114	6,920	56,194
Indiana.....	1,104	439,150	424	318,100	127,000	191,100	Tennessee.....	150	337,476	139	310,916	104,380	206,536
Iowa.....	4,558	113,980	198	82,665	42,154	40,511	Texas.....	2,030	862,059	126	543,158	88,671	454,487
Kansas.....	3,420	292,460	195	292,460	180,455	112,005	Vermont.....	263	36,508	70	21,551	14,987	6,564
Kentucky.....	228	359,091	127	305,565	108,514	197,051	Washington.....	524	242,240	104	184,502	48,948	135,554
Louisiana.....	67	235,591	19	49,974	35,234	14,740	West Virginia.....	55	106,608	42	90,299	32,161	58,138
Maine.....	497	84,803	343	77,176	19,690	57,486	Wisconsin.....	5,778	189,074	289	70,095	33,215	36,880
Maryland.....	24	280,130	24	280,130	67,138	212,992	Alaska.....	31	20,876	0	0	0	0
Massachusetts.....	351	558,708	146	213,748	131,368	82,380	Hawaii.....	5	42,548	5	42,548	15,929	26,619
Michigan.....	4,532	526,287	180	239,038	162,476	76,562	Puerto Rico.....	77	46,348	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
Minnesota ¹	5,441	419,453	158	172,589	108,354	64,235							
Mississippi ¹	1,417	117,608	63	61,832	41,689	20,143	38 States.....	42,509	11,630,883	7,513	7,941,267	2,918,061	5,023,206
Montana.....	1,274	33,610	35	7,000	4,500	2,500	United States.....		16,013,882		10,933,866	4,017,708	6,916,158
Nevada.....	171	21,346	22	3,031	1,986	1,045							

¹ Data based on local planning areas instead of local school administrative units.

² All of the 395 deficit units have exhausted their statutory bonding capacity.

³ The territory is a single fiscal unit for school construction, with applicable resources of \$21,953,000 and a deficit of \$24,415,000.

⁴ Projected on the basis of enrollments in all States and territories, rounded to thousands, from data reported from 38 States enrolling 72.62965 percent of the pupils in the fall of 1954.

It is my considered opinion that the passage of the Kelley bill in its present form, except for some essential committee amendments, will clear this legislation for Senate action.

As a member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor that drafted this bill I agreed with my colleagues that this would be offered on a nonpartisan basis. Title I is a grant-in-aid plan drafted by the committee itself. Titles II and III were taken from President Eisenhower's proposal and were prepared by the Health, Education, and Welfare Department.

It is my plan to offer amendments to both titles II and III to remove certain objections raised in the Rules Committee. These will be authorized committee amendments. One will restore the authority of the Comptroller General to audit and control all expenditures under the act and would apply to both title II and title III.

The other committee amendment will show the exact amount of Government obligation under title III.

I shall oppose any and all crippling amendments in order that we can send

to the other body a bill that has an excellent chance of final approval.

In conclusion let me once more plead with you, my colleagues, that we keep uppermost in our minds the humanitarian angle. America needs now, a strong, well educated, and virile citizenry. We must disregard the plea of those who for selfish or political reasons are opposed to approving this effort in the interest of national security, the preservation of our Republic and our American way of life.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, last year I introduced a bill (H. R. 2857) to provide a program of Federal loans to those school districts which are unable to finance school construction due to the lack of an adequate tax base. I am happy to see that the administration and the committee have adopted my thinking along these lines and have included the provision contained in title II of the bill presently under consideration to provide Federal funds for the purchase of bonds of those districts which cannot otherwise finance their school construction. This is, I believe, a very necessary addition to the program for Federal aid to education.

It is imperative that this legislation under consideration be enacted. Let me give you an example of how it is needed by one school district in my area, a district that typifies the suburban "bedroom" areas of Wayne County. The district comprises an area of 2½ square miles just west of Dearborn. Prior to 1950, it was farmland with one 6-room school serving the entire area. However, about that time, small home developments began with the result that the school membership has been increasing at about 30 percent each year over the previous year. Here are the figures on it:

School year:	Elementary membership
1951-52.....	575
1952-53.....	723
1953-54.....	975
1954-55.....	1,222
1955-56.....	1,485
1956-57 (estimated).....	2,000

Of course, the tax base has also been increasing. Assessed valuation is almost entirely composed of residential property—with an average home being assessed in the range of \$4,000 to \$4,500. The school district has no industrial tax

base and only limited commercial property. The total assessed valuations during the years from 1951 to 1957 are as follows:

	Assessed valuation
1951-52.....	\$2,100,000
1952-53.....	3,600,000
1953-54.....	5,400,000
1954-55.....	7,600,000
1955-56.....	9,500,000
1956-57.....	11,600,000

During that period the school-facilities investments have totaled about \$1½ million and just recently the community voted an additional \$2-million bond issue for further work.

The community is making every attempt to work out its school-construction problems; however, assistance will be needed in the future.

School census statistics show that this district will have a 4,000-pupil membership by 1961. To house the children will take approximately \$4 million over and above the expenditures now authorized. Maximum forecast tax base will be about \$18 million assessed valuation, not sufficient to support the bond-retirement requirements for such a program. The new bond issue will put the outstanding debt at about \$3.1 million—about 30 percent of assessed valuation, and principal retirements can average only about \$80,000 annually. A locally sponsored program would necessitate a debt ratio in 1959-60 of over 40 percent for school purposes only.

I believe this one example shows clearly the urgent need for the legislation under consideration. This is not an isolated case; other school districts face the same problems. I therefore strongly urge that favorable action be taken to provide the greatly needed Federal aid.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN].

(Mr. HENDERSON and Mr. BYRD asked and were given permission to extend their remarks following those of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.)

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, the bill which we are presently considering is the most important piece of legislation which the present session of the Congress has had before it. I think all of us are thoroughly agreed that our children are our greatest national asset. The issue revolves around the question of the way in which the Federal Government should assist in the construction of classrooms. There are those who feel it is not advisable to lend any assistance, but it is my hope that a majority of the Members of the House and of the other body will feel that we should do something now to assist in a serious shortage of classrooms throughout the Nation.

I believe this legislation is realistic, sound in principle, and that it will be effective in action. It will provide prompt and effective relief for a serious problem. As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I am naturally interested in the bill. I have served in both the 83d and 84th Congresses on special subcommittees on school construction.

At this time I would like to congratulate the fine leadership of the respective chairmen of the subcommittees, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]. In both committees and in the full committee this problem was discussed thoroughly, objectively, and with little or no partisanship. I trust that that will be true also during the present discussion of this bill.

I would like to comment very briefly on some references which others have made about this bill. It was asserted yesterday, for instance, that we were departing from a basic principle if we should adopt legislation of this kind and that the result would be that we would take education out of the hands of the local people. In my opinion, that is a total misunderstanding of what is being suggested. Everybody feels very strongly that control of the educational system of this country should remain at the local level. That feeling is no argument against financial assistance under certain terms by the Federal Government. I likewise think it is pure distortion to charge that this is a corrupt scheme to buy votes or for any other reason. It is not easy to come up with any kind of specific legislation of this kind without running into certain problems, but our intentions are honorable and the objective is desirable.

Coming from one of the so-called wealthy States, I would like to discuss the problem of why we should pay out more from our States in order to support a program of this kind. The simple fact is that it is unquestionably in the national interest to relieve a nationwide shortage of classrooms. We should always seek to legislate in the national interest. If we should operate on an essentially selfish basis, putting the dollar sign first, and say we will consider no Federal-aid program unless our State receives more than it must pay in taxes, we would cripple many good programs that have proved their worth to the Nation. In my own hometown, for example, we have a hospital built in part with Federal money under the Hill-Burton program. We have just passed a rural library assistance bill. We have passed a tremendous highway construction program. We have had flood control and emergency relief and have provided money for soil conservation and timberland, and for parks, rivers and harbors. All these uses of Federal funds are for good purposes. This program is also for a good purpose.

Mention was made yesterday, before the rule was adopted, about the length of time which had elapsed before this bill could be brought to the floor. I think members of the Committee on Education and Labor should certainly not be blamed for the 11-month delay since the bill was reported out by the committee.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] pointed out yesterday that hearings on school-construction bills began in March 1955. I should like to say again that the subject was discussed in the 83d Congress. At that time, you will recall, President Eisenhower had made no specific recommendations. It was

not until receipt of his special message on education in February 1955, that consideration could be given to the proposals now incorporated in this bill. A bill providing a 2-year program of emergency construction assistance was, however, approved by the Kearns subcommittee on August 1954. And in December 1954, a unanimous report by the nine-man subcommittee was submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor. I shall read just a few paragraphs from that:

The hearings held by the subcommittee have demonstrated that the national interest requires that the Federal Government join with State and local governments in solving this pressing problem. Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by the serious classroom shortages which exist in every State.

While the subcommittee has not yet reached agreement on any one particular bill, it is clear that Federal legislation is needed, and that this legislation must be designed to encourage State and local efforts to meet the problem. Care must be taken to avoid any possibility of Federal control over local school systems, or any tendency for Federal action to supplant State and local efforts. The subcommittee is confident that early in the coming session agreement can be reached on legislation to accomplish these objectives.

That, I repeat, was back in December 1954. In 1955, the Kelley subcommittee held hearings over a 3-month period, from March to May. After intensive consideration during June of the features of various bills, a compromise bill was adopted on July 1. After making certain changes, the full committee adopted what is now before us as H. R. 7535.

We have had already some discussion of the basic objective of the legislation and the reasons for it. I should like to reiterate certain points. In the first place, the basic purpose of this bill must be emphasized. We are anxious to help in the building of more classrooms promptly. No one questions that the Nation needs more classrooms. We feel very strongly that the Nation needs them now. We feel also that these classrooms can be provided essentially by lending help of various kinds to States and local communities so that they can help themselves.

The Federal grants provided in this bill should not be overemphasized as a solution, or the only solution to the problem. The grant program will be helpful, but admittedly it will provide comparatively few of the total classrooms which are needed. By requiring matching funds, however, the purpose of this title is to make available more money to build schools in the areas of greatest need and where there is the least capacity to meet that need. These grants are only one of a variety of weapons which the Federal Government is making available. In my own opinion, the provisions for credit assistance and the purchase of bonds may have even greater significance as the program develops.

From the discussion thus far, it is plain to see that the bill is controversial. Mention was made yesterday about the lack of enthusiasm for a bill of this kind.

In my opinion, public opinion throughout the Nation definitely supports assistance such as we are suggesting. In January 1956 the Gallup Poll indicates that 67 percent of those polled would be in favor of construction assistance. All parts of the country, and members of both political parties were reported solidly sympathetic to such aid. In two successive years the constituents in my district, in answer to questionnaires, have supported Federal aid construction assistance by percentages of about 70 percent. For various reasons, I hope we are going to approve this legislation. If enacted, there will surely result an accelerated program of school construction. Passage of the bill will mark a milestone in legislative history by making the Federal Government a partner over a 4, or perhaps 5-year, period with States and local communities in the construction of hundreds of thousands of public schools throughout this country.

There have been, of course, many problems which we have considered in committee, some of which we are discussing now in connection with this particular bill.

There has been, for example, much testimony regarding the extent of the need which exists. The gentleman from West Virginia has pointed out that the birth rate in this country has gone up from an average of about 2,500,000 a year to approximately 4 million in 1955. As of now, there are approximately 2,200,000 children who are being taught in double sessions or in inadequate quarters. Roughly 80,000 rooms are needed to eliminate that overcrowding.

In addition, during the next 4 years it is estimated that 180,000 classrooms will be obsolete. We will need an estimated 210,000 for the new growth in our school-age population. The population of the country has gone up 14.5 percent in the 10-year period 1940 to 1950. The classroom shortage, of course, is aggravated by the fact that the growth of some areas has been much more rapid than others. The three Pacific States grew 48.8 percent in this 10-year period. It is because the impact varies in different areas that the question of distribution of funds is a difficult one to solve.

Before going into the question of the philosophy behind the bill I should like to make a very brief quotation from the farewell address of George Washington, which indicates again that the Federal Government has long had an interest in education:

It is substantially true that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who, that is a sincere friend to it, can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened.

There were many early indications of interest in education, going back to the period before the Constitution was adopted, with land grants made in 1785.

In 1861, almost 100 years ago, Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act, giving funds to land-grant colleges. Federal grants thus authorized, as my colleagues from the West will testify, made possible the fine educational system of our Western States.

Interestingly enough, President Buchanan 2 years previous to the action by President Lincoln had vetoed a similar bill. The justification for his action was interesting and may not sound unfamiliar to us today. He said the bill would encourage States to rely on Federal aid instead of expending their own resources for education.

Having spoken of these events of a hundred years ago, I should like now to mention some of the current attitudes toward this legislation. I have been somewhat disturbed by some of the current criticisms of this particular bill, and of any other legislation of this kind. There are those who feel that Federal aid to education is something that is easy to criticize. They are skeptical of any program in this field. The critics often make no distinction about the kind of Federal aid, the reasons for the assistance, or the importance of the problem which it is hoped to solve by participation of the Government. They even question the reality of the need for the classrooms. They say, "Prove it," but they then do not wait for an answer. They feel that if Washington helps it will set up a bad precedent and perhaps we might even end up with "socialized education." Such fears are unfounded if we examine this bill now before us.

Even those not openly hostile will often be extremely cautious. They are chary of authorizing Federal assistance lest this aid be the foot in the door which disrupts the traditional, generally approved ways of dealing with educational problems. There exists also, I think, a genuine apprehension on the part of some individuals about the proposed assistance. The fact that the apprehension is based largely upon misapprehensions about what is proposed makes it nonetheless real.

Will Federal assistance result in Federal control of our schools? There are those who honestly believe that will be the result. There are those who will capitalize on those fears that this will happen, even though they know such a result is highly unlikely. I am convinced that under the bill we are considering there is no honest basis for such a conclusion. Underlying the skepticism and the misapprehension, and of far greater significance, is a real awareness of the importance of providing our children with adequate education. If we can only set up the right kind of program, and accelerate the building of classrooms, and if we do it so as to preserve traditional concepts, I think we shall find wide support for this bill.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I yield.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me that proper education for our children does not necessarily come out of bricks and mortar. We are getting a great many really serious criticisms of

the education our children are not getting in the schools—that they can neither read nor multiply nor divide or write or spell.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. That I do not think would be a proper subject for Federal intervention.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I think that is an entirely local problem.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. Yes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. It was felt that the field of construction, providing assistance to house these children, would be a proper and responsible role for the Federal Government. In this bill there is no possibility of controlling the curriculum, improving the quality of teaching, or providing funds for the operation of schools or teachers' salaries or any such thing. I doubt if there would be any strong support for such ideas if they were brought up in separate legislation.

Mrs. FRANCES P. BOLTON. I am happy to have the gentleman say so.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Let me state that I feel that H. R. 7535, which incorporates many of the important recommendations of President Eisenhower, preserves local initiative and control. It is an emergency program of cooperation between all levels of Government and not a taking over by the Federal Government of the financing of our schools.

The grant-in-aid provisions of this bill will provide about \$1,250,000,000 which must be matched by State or local funds. Since the needed construction is estimated at about \$15 billion, these Federal grants in themselves will hardly put a dent in the total needs. The grants are to be provided on the basis of plans approved by the States. The States will decide the need, and inability of certain school districts to meet that need. I feel the State plans will insure there will not be Federal control. I consider them an essential part of a program of this kind.

Perhaps the best way to emphasize the philosophy behind the program is to read briefly some quotations from various public statements of President Eisenhower. As far back as his state of the Union message on February 2, 1953, the President referred to the school situation in these words, and I quote:

This administration is profoundly aware of two great needs born of our living in a complex industrial economy. First, the individual citizen must have safeguards against personal disaster inflicted by forces beyond his control; second, the welfare of the people demands effective and economical performance by the Government of certain indispensable social services.

Then the President continues:

Our school system demands some prompt, effective help. During each of the last 2 years, more than 1½ million children have swelled the elementary and secondary school population of the country. Generally, the school population is proportionately higher in States with low per capita income. This whole situation calls for careful congressional study and action. I am sure you share my conviction that the firm conditions of Federal aid must be proved need and proved lack of local income.

I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. I just wanted to make it clear that so far as I know the President has never recommended the Kelley bill about which the gentleman is speaking.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. If the gentleman will bear with me, he will see there are many features of the Kelley bill incorporated directly from the specific recommendations to the Congress by the President of the United States. This bill is not 100 percent perfect. It is a compromise measure. I feel some amendments should be made in the Kelley bill, but many essential provisions of the Eisenhower approach are incorporated in H. R. 7535.

Mr. YOUNGER. The essential features of all aid bills has been the formula by which the money is distributed.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. I agree that the formula should be changed if we are going to adopt the philosophy of President Eisenhower. I shall support such action.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. In the State of the Union message of January 7, 1954, the President said:

Youth—our greatest resource—is being seriously neglected in a vital respect. The Nation as a whole is not preparing teachers or building schools fast enough to keep up with the increase in our population.

The preparation of teachers as, indeed, the control and direction of public education policy, is a State and local responsibility. However, the Federal Government should stand ready to assist States which demonstrably cannot provide sufficient school buildings. In order to appraise the needs, I hope that this year a conference on education will be held in each State, culminating in a national conference. From these conferences on education, every level of government—from the Federal Government to each local school board—should gain the information with which to attack this serious problem.

On February 8, 1955, President Eisenhower submitted his first special message on education, proposing what he described "a plan of Federal cooperation with the States, designed to give our schoolchildren as quickly as possible the classrooms they must have." In his opinion "the present shortage requires immediate effective action that will produce more rapid results." His four-point program to meet this emergency he then described as "a broad effort to widen the accepted channels of financing school construction and to increase materially the flow of private lending through them, without interference with the responsibility of State and local school systems. Over the next 3 years, this proposed effort envisages a total of \$7 billion put to work building badly needed new schools, in addition to construction expenditures outside these proposals."

Again this year, on January 12, the President sent another message to Congress regarding education. Key sections of this message are well worth quoting:

THE NEED FOR FEDERAL AID IN MEETING THE CLASSROOM SHORTAGE

The responsibility for public education rests with the States and the local commu-

nities. Federal action which infringes upon this principle is alien to our system. But our history has demonstrated that the Federal Government, in the interest of the whole people, can and should help with certain problems of nationwide scope and concern when States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve the full problem or solve it rapidly enough.

Clearly this is the kind of situation we face today in considering the school-classroom shortage. In the war and postwar periods school construction was drastically curtailed by shortages of materials. And then schools were filled to overflowing by the largest, most rapid enrollment increase in history. Today hundreds of thousands of children study under overcrowded conditions, in half-day or doubled-up school sessions, or in makeshift buildings not designed as schools. Further, many classrooms in use today are obsolete, inadequate—and each year more rooms become so. School enrollments will continue to increase rapidly over the years ahead—and this will require still more classrooms.

Against this backdrop of needs, States and communities are substantially increasing their classroom construction. But many communities simply do not have available locally the resources needed to cope both with the legacy of shortages from past years and with future needs. Unless these communities get help, they simply cannot provide enough good schools. The best estimates indicate that, on a nationwide basis, the current rate of construction only a little more than meets each year's new enrollment and replacement needs. This rate barely dents the large accumulation of needs from past years.

The rate of classroom construction must be further increased, as the White House Conference on Education asked, by a greater combined effort of local and State governments. And the Conference concluded that Federal assistance also is necessary. The facts support this conclusion.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSALS

A year ago I proposed a Federal program designed to aid the States and communities in overcoming the classroom shortage. The Congress has not yet enacted legislation. In the light of a full year of further experience and study, in the light of congressional hearings and the White House Conference on Education, I now submit a revised and broadened program to meet our pressing classroom needs. I propose—

A program of Federal grants amounting to \$1,250 million, at a rate of \$250 million annually for 5 years, matched with State funds, to supplement local construction efforts in the neediest school districts.

A program to authorize \$750 million over 5 years for Federal purchase of local school construction bonds when school districts cannot sell them in private markets at reasonable interest rates.

A 5-year program of advances to help provide reserves for bonds issued by State school-financing agencies. These bonds would finance local construction of schools to be rented and eventually owned by the local school systems.

A 5-year, \$20 million program of matching grants to States for planning to help communities and States overcome obstacles to their financing of school construction.

If speedily and fully utilized, this Federal program, added to the increased basic efforts of States and communities, should overcome the Nation's critical classroom shortage within 5 years. Once this shortage is overcome, the Federal-grant program can and must terminate. The States and localities should then go forward, without Federal funds, to meet their current and future needs. Present construction levels indicate their ability to do this.

I am confident the Federal Government with this program can help construct schools without in any way weakening the American tradition that control of education must be kept close to the local communities. Any legislation enacted should embody this principle.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES IN FEDERAL GRANTS

I strongly urge the Congress, in providing grants for school construction, to follow certain principles, which are indispensable if Federal aid is to serve the cause of American education most effectively.

The first broad principle is that Federal grants must not reduce the incentive for State and local efforts—but rather should stimulate an increase in such efforts. If Federal funds are used merely to replace funds which otherwise would or could be provided at State and local levels, there is no net gain of schools for our children. I propose, therefore, that Federal grants be matched by State appropriations. Because many of the State legislatures will not have a session this year, I recommend, in order to speed the program at the outset, that during the first year of the 5-year period the matching of Federal funds may be by either the States or by local school districts. The requirement for State matching will result in a larger total program of school construction, and will assure active participation of the States in improving laws relating to financing of school construction, as well as sound administration of the program.

Furthermore, I propose a formula to reduce the proportion of Federal funds for those few States which are noticeably lagging, behind their ability, to support their public schools. This feature should act as an incentive for the lagging States to increase their effort.

Another fundamental principle is that Federal funds, under this type of program, should be distributed according to relative need. We must recognize that some States have more financial resources than others. We must recognize that a weakness in education anywhere is a weakness in the Nation as a whole. Federal appropriations will most quickly accomplish the most good if a relatively larger share of Federal funds is distributed where local and State resources are least adequate to meet classroom needs.

I propose that this principle be fulfilled in three ways: First, in distributing Federal funds, larger amounts per school-age child should be allotted to States with lower income per child. Second, in fixing matching requirements, States with lower income should not be required to put up as large a proportion of funds as higher income States. For the Nation as a whole, the total of State matching funds would approximately equal the total of Federal funds. Third, as the States distribute these funds, the highest priority should be given to school districts with the least economic ability to meet their needs.

The President has many times expressed the conviction that the ultimate solution to our educational problems lies in public understanding and in the determination of citizens to take effective action in their own communities and States. The educational policies and proposals of this administration are consistent with this basic philosophy. They represent a grassroots approach to ending the crisis in our schools—an approach aimed at encouraging the kind of local responsibility and individual initiative which has made our educational system great.

The State and White House conferences on education recently concluded are outstanding examples of the vitality and worth of this grassroots approach to

the solution of the problems confronting our schools.

In the course of this program every State in the Union, four Territories, and the District of Columbia held a conference at which citizens critically reviewed their educational policies and needs. In all of the States the Governor appointed committees of laymen and educators to organize the conference and to help gather the facts and information needed. Most States held more than one statewide meeting. Many held district and community conferences. All told, there were over 3,600 such citizen conferences, involving over half a million persons, held prior to the White House conference last December.

These conferences, including the White House conference, were for the most part devoted to a consideration of ways and means of improving educational opportunities—of overcoming critical shortages of good teachers and adequate school facilities—by community and State action. The results—solid, encouraging results—are already apparent in many States and communities, and more are yet to come. As the President summed them up:

The conferences helped to erase the corrod- ing notion that schools were the other person's responsibility.

Out of these citizen conferences there came a clear request for Federal financial assistance in meeting the nationwide shortage of classrooms. These are the words of the Committee for the White House Conference on Education:

This committee believes that Federal aid for school construction should be made available on a limited basis to all States and Territories and the District of Columbia to help overcome the present school building emergency. It believes, also, that Federal funds should be provided under the philosophy of encouraging greater use of State and local funds for school purposes. We believe that the best schools can be produced by continuing to assign to the States and local districts primary responsibility for financing, organizing, administering, and controlling the public schools. The committee believes that Federal aid to all the States can be justified, however, only on a temporary basis to meet an emergency situation such as the present school building emergency.

The White House conference and a majority of the State conferences which considered Federal aid, urged that Federal funds be made available to help the States and local school districts overcome the huge backlog shortage of classrooms which has developed in the aftermath of depression and war. These citizens recognized that, while the rate of school construction is meeting present requirements and is slowly reducing the enormous deficit in school facilities, Federal assistance is needed if this critical deficit is to be eliminated in the foreseeable future.

The President, as I have just indicated, has sent to Congress specific proposals for a temporary program of Federal assistance which would accomplish that end. These proposals, many of which are embodied in the bill now before us, are soundly based upon the philosophy of this administration as stated by the President. They constitute an emergency program to solve a problem which

the States and communities—acting independently—cannot solve quickly enough. It is a problem of nationwide scope and concern—one which in a very real sense involves our national security and well-being.

The President's school construction aid program would assist every State; but assistance would recognize relative financial need among the States and would require the States to match the Federal funds according to their ability to do so. It would penalize States notably lagging in effort to finance their educational needs. It would stimulate further State efforts and would encourage States and localities to overcome obstacles to providing adequate financial support for school construction.

This program closely follows the recommendations of the White House Conference and those made at a number of State conferences. It is in line with the thoughtful recommendations of the President's Committee for the White House Conference. This Committee, composed of 33 outstanding citizens representing both educators and laymen as well as every section of the Nation and nearly every walk of life, made a careful, independent study of America's school needs for more than a year.

The President's school construction program is true to the basic education policy of the Administration, indeed, to that of the Nation. It encourages local responsibility for good schools. It does not infringe in any manner upon local control of our system of free public education. At the same time, it will help solve a major problem of grave national concern.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS].

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, I expect to oppose this legislation and vote against it. This proposed legislation that is now before the House for consideration is very important in many ways. It involves new principles of government, the like of which have never been exercised before in our great country that I know of. Heretofore we have been proud of our public schools and were glad to think that they are typical of America. Our schools truly come from the people, and they have truly been by the people, and there is no question but that they have always been for the people.

We are now finding ourselves being requested to change our system of education and make it a part of the Government and under the direct control of the Federal Government. I read over the bill that is before us for consideration and there is nothing like it anywhere in our lawbooks. In the first few lines of this proposed legislation, I find this language:

Sec. 101. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1956, and the three succeeding fiscal years, such amounts, not to exceed \$400 million in any fiscal year, as may be necessary for making payments to State educational agencies under this title.

Boldly we set out with a program that is going to cost us \$400 million before we do anything else.

Another startling feature of this proposed legislation is that in the second section of this bill, immediately following the provision providing for this colossal appropriation, is language as follows:

Sec. 102. From the total funds appropriated for any fiscal year pursuant to section 101, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to the total funds so appropriated as the school-age population of the State bears to the total of the school-age populations of all the States.

In this language you will see that this proposed legislation provides for the appointment of a Commissioner who will have more power to spend more money than any man, anywhere, in any branch of the Government.

In other words, this Congress, by this legislation, is asked to appropriate this tremendous amount of money every year, if necessary, to be administered by a Commissioner, about whom we do not know anything, and who is not elected by the people, and over whom the people have little or no control.

Those who favor this proposed legislation most ardently, I presume, feel that the Government should take charge of the public schools in the country and administer them from Washington. I take a directly opposite view of the origin and function of our public schools. I maintain that the public schools owe their origin absolutely to local people and have come up in strength, and in power, and in usefulness through the townships, through the counties, and up to the State. In other words the little red schoolhouse was not located somewhere waiting for the pioneers to come and use it. On the contrary—the little red schoolhouse was built by the pioneers as soon as they could afford to build it, and proudly they used it for the benefit of their children and for the benefit of the community, and for the benefit of the Nation. Abraham Lincoln and most of our great men are a product of the county and State schools, and not the product of a school established and managed out of Washington.

I feel very strongly about this proposed legislation because it is directly contrary to all of my experiences—and I think would be opposed by most of our people in my section of the country. No doubt some of our people will be carried away by the propaganda that the Federal Government is going to give us a lot of money for construction of schoolhouses and the maintenance of our schools. These people must not forget, however, that we will be called upon to pay our part, and under this proposed legislation, our part will be much more in proportion than it is now. Ohio has every reason to be proud of its school system and to be proud of the products of its schools and colleges. I know that our people in Ohio are willing to do for others as much as we can, but from our pioneer days up to now we have built our schools in such a way that we are proud of them and proud of their products. I may appear to be

somewhat enthusiastic about the public schools of Ohio, but I have been closely identified with them for many years, and I am, of course, proud of what they have done and what they are doing.

The district that I have the honor to represent is comprised of eight counties. It runs along the Ohio River about 150 miles, then runs back to the north about 125 miles. In that territory, and 2 other adjoining counties, are located the 3 oldest settlements in the Northwest Territory. Also in my district is located the oldest university west of the Allegheny Mountains. I refer to Ohio University, at Athens, Ohio. From this university and the schools in this section of Ohio have gone forth thousands of educated men and women who have met and helped conquer the most difficult problems that have confronted our great Nation from its earliest days up to now, when it ranks, beyond any question, as the greatest nation in the world.

My colleagues, I hesitate to encroach upon a system that is so distinctively of the people, by the people, and for the people.

Mr. Chairman, I am personally interested in school legislation because I have most of my life been closely connected with the schools. Like most of the children in my section of southern Ohio, I walked over the hill and up the railroad about 2 miles every day, and at 17 years of age, I was teaching school in a little schoolhouse that had few facilities—and where they paid me the fabulous sum of \$25 a month. After teaching school in a rural section and as a high school principal, I worked my way through Providence University and also through Ohio State University, which was then and is now one of the greatest universities in the world. This experience convinced me that something should be done to give those smart children of that hilly country a better chance. The deep snows, the high fences, and the swollen streams kept these children at home a good portion of the time. My chance to do something for them came when I was elected to the State Senate of Ohio in 1922. I had become quite voluble over this problem of education, and I coined a sentence that found its way around the country, in school journals, and so forth. This is what it was, "We must educate the children where we find them, and we must tax wealth where it is to be found."

In my district, in those days there were many coal mines—and many of the children of these coal miners were denied the opportunity to attend school with any kind of regularity. The men and the companies who owned these mines shipped much of the coal to the north and northwestern sections of the country, but, of course, they gave little heed to the welfare of the children from the standpoint of education. One day I talked with one of these mine owners, who proved to be, in my estimation, a very fine gentleman. I knew that he had built a big hotel in one of the northern cities from the money he made in the coal business and also he had become the head of a large bank—as the result of his fortune made by reason of the manual labor by the parents of these children who were being denied an edu-

cation. This man proved his manliness by immediately espousing my motto, and admitted that he had made his wealth from the sweat of the brow of these workers—and he would be willing to do his part in educating the children. I consulted with teachers, businessmen, and statisticians, until we worked out what we thought would be a formula that would solve our problem. Here is what it was. We agreed that the schools should be maintained from a public source—that is, from taxes. We also agreed that education was a State problem and that the great State of Ohio should adequately maintain the schools of the State. We decided that what we called the poor school districts should be assisted by the metropolitan areas. We estimated that it would require the taxes from \$6,000 worth of taxable property to maintain one pupil.

I introduced a bill in the State senate which was described and spoken of "as a bill to establish an equalization fund." It provided that any section in which the property was not of such value as to be worth as many \$6,000 as there were schoolchildren should be assisted. In other words my bill established a State equalization fund taken from public taxes of the State and from that fund the weak school districts should be provided with sufficient funds to maintain them as they should be maintained. In other words all the poor school districts were taken care of.

As soon as I introduced this bill, the news went over the State very rapidly, and the teachers, school organizations, and many public authorities immediately indicated their approval, and encouraged me in my efforts.

To the everlasting credit and honor of the State senators from the rich districts, when the vote came on my proposal, every senator in the State voted his approval. The same was true as to the house of representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I maintain that "we must educate the children where we find them, and that we must tax wealth where it is located." I maintain that up to now we have taken care of the schools and schoolchildren on a home basis. On a State basis. And that we will make a mistake to bring our public schools under the direct control of the Government in Washington.

And, Mr. Chairman, I forgot to say that while we were working our way in the school-maintenance program we encountered the fact that many of the teachers in those so-called poor districts had not been paid for many months. They had a total of more than a million dollars coming to them and we took care of them in my bill. My bill brought to those sections, a number of fine centralized schoolbuildings and my bill brought many schoolbuses which haul the children. I think we are well satisfied and do not want Washington to take us over.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, we are approaching through the course of this debate, that momentous decision which will indicate to the United States of America and the world whether this Con-

gress respects law and order, or whether this Congress shall be an accomplice to the violations of the decisions of the Supreme Court. The issues before us are legal, but more than that, moral and ethical. On one hand we find a group of people believing in the relative values of the material, and on the other hand, a group that believes in the absolute values of the spirit. America surged to greatness because it was founded by men who placed the spiritual above the material. By the rude bridge that arched the flood the embattled farmers stood because they believed in things spiritual.

Now certain things are self-evident; you cannot teach respect for law and order in schools built in defiance of law and order. You cannot teach loyalty to "one nation indivisible" in schools that Jim Crow its students in absolute defiance of the Supreme Court of the United States. You cannot bring about integration through segregated schools.

During the past year and a half, I have exhausted every possible avenue trying to find someone, someone in authority, who would speak the word so that I would be sure that my amendments were not vitally necessary. I have asked this question of everyone: "Is it not illegal and immoral to appropriate Federal funds to any State which, not by public opinion, but by legislative action, has voted to defy the law of the land?" Not a single person nor organization has been able to factually indicate that I am wrong.

I will cite seven different attitudes toward this amendment:

First. Our President has consistently said that my amendments are extraneous and unnecessary. Yet repeated correspondence with him has failed to bring forth one statement from him or his assistants that he would use the executive power of his office to keep Federal funds from going to those States that are in defiance of the law of the land. It is possible that he might do so after this bill becomes law, but I do not want to posit the moral future of our country, the respect for the Supreme Court, and Federal law and order upon mere speculation.

Second. The Comptroller General of the United States has told me and I quote from his letter:

On the fundamental basis that it is for the Congress to say how and on what conditions public moneys shall be spent, the position of the General Accounting Office as the agent of the Congress is to give full effect to enactments of the Congress.

Third, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will administer this act, both Mrs. Hobby and her successor, Mr. Folsom, have indicated that they would do nothing to withhold the money.

Fourth, Mr. Walter Lippmann, the New York Times, the Christian Science Monitor, have said that a taxpayer's suit could obtain an injunction against the use of such funds. This is absolutely untrue. In the case of Massachusetts versus Mellon in 1923, the Supreme Court ruled out any taxpayer's suit for any such purpose.

Fifth, the reactionary, anticivil rights wing of the new united labor movement has done and is doing all it can to lobby

against my amendment. One of its paid hired hands, Arthur J. Goldberg wrote:

All public schools in the States must be operated on a nonsegregated basis, it necessarily follows that public schools built with Federal aid constitutionally can only be operated on a nonsegregated basis.

Mr. Goldberg is a self-appointed tenth member of the Supreme Court, one of the nonvoting members. His legal opinion is ridiculous.

First, during the past 2 years since the Supreme Court decision, public schools have been built with Federal funds in the impacted areas and they have been and are being built on a Jim Crow, segregated basis. Why didn't the Supreme Court stop this? Anybody who advances the facetious argument that the Supreme Court decision is sufficient need only realize that right now in this House we appropriated since the Supreme Court decision for Jim Crow, segregated educational purposes in 6 defiant States—Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Virginia—\$75 million per year of Federal funds. If the Supreme Court decision is adequate then why is it that this Federal money is being spent now for segregated education? I have asked this question of the President, the Comptroller General, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and have met always the same answer—the Supreme Court will take care of it. Is has not and it cannot.

There are those who say the Supreme Court has the power to compel compliance with its decisions. How? They are not dealing now with individuals or organizations or groups. They are dealing with entire States which by legislative action have voted. How are you going to force an entire sovereign State to comply with a Supreme Court decision? No one dares suggest the use of Federal troops. This would be a confession of the moral decadence of our country. There are not enough Federal marshals to force compliance. So, that is an utterly ridiculous statement. The truth is that during all of the years when the Supreme Court doctrine was "separate but equal" it was never obeyed except, and only except, when the President, through executive order, or this Body, through legislative action, implemented the Supreme Court decision.

After 56 years of the doctrine of "separate but equal"—

Current expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance, 1952

State	White	Negro
Georgia.....	\$190.15	\$115.39
Alabama.....	172.48	107.84
Mississippi.....	147.49	39.93
South Carolina.....	195.50	98.14
Florida.....	221.20	159.77
North Carolina.....	185.30	149.60

Overall expenditures for school construction and maintenance, 1953-54

State	Construction		Maintenance	
	Negro	White	Negro	White
Alabama.....	\$2,194,000	\$7,771,000		
Florida.....	9,114,000	28,280,000	\$516,000	\$4,092,000
Mississippi.....	1,757,000	3,802,000	357,000	1,437,000

You cannot escape this stark fact: The Supreme Court has never had the power to compel any State to obey any of its decisions. It does not have that power now. We have a very rich legislative history here in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress on implementing the Supreme Court decision. We did it with the Draft Act when Representative Hamilton Fish in this House and Senator Robert Wagner in the other House introduced a nondiscriminatory amendment which was passed by record vote. We did it again in the Hill-Burton Act when the committee itself brought forth a nondiscriminatory provision. We did it again in the Federal school lunch program when you adopted my amendment. Now, the doctrine of separate but equal has changed to the doctrine of integration. This is the first opportunity we have had to implement the Supreme Court decision which is our legislative duty and history. What the executive branch of Government does or does not do is not germane to the duty that we, the legislative branch of the Government, have clearly defined. When any branch of government—executive, judicial, or legislative—hands down an order, decision, or a law, it is then incumbent upon all of the other branches of government to yield to whatever those decisions, orders, or laws may be.

From where do we get this new concept that the protection of basic liberties should be left solely to the courts? In reality, are not the courts the last and not the first resort for the protection of basic rights?

Sixth, then there are those who say—we believe that the Powell amendment is right in principle but the issue should be taken up separately. May I point out that for 9 years my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. DOLLINGER] has introduced a bill "to withhold Federal Aid from schools which discriminate between students by reason of their race, color, religion, ancestry, and national origin." That bill is before the Committee on Education and Labor right now, H. R. 3305, and yet not a single thing has been done for 9 years to bring this bill before the House.

Seventh, then again, there is another group that says—look, 300,000 children have been integrated already. It is to aid those very same consecrated, dedicated, white southerners who have dared to build expanding islands of democracy in the morass of defiance that I offer these amendments. But the fact that 300,000 have been integrated in the past 2 years is not sufficient to excuse those States who by legislative action are totally in defiance of the Supreme Court and have not integrated a single school district in eight States.

The Board of Education of the State of Georgia has voted to revoke for life the teaching certificates of any teachers who give instruction to colored and white pupils in the same public school classrooms. Also State aid will be cut off from those school districts that vote to integrate classes.

In his inaugural address on January 11, 1955, Gov. Marvin Griffin, of Georgia, said:

The Supreme Court of the United States issued an unthinkable decision, outlawing school segregation. * * * We Georgia people are firm in our conviction that this tyranny must be resisted with every resource at our command.

Officials in Prince Edward County, Va., have voted not to appropriate funds for public schools during the coming year for the purpose of resisting the Court's decision.

In a radio broadcast over the Columbia Broadcasting System on June 4, 1955, a Member of the other body said:

Regardless of whatever decree the United States Supreme Court might issue in the foreseeable future, it will be a nullity in every school district in the State of Mississippi.

The Alabama Legislature has passed a bill which has as its purpose the evasion of the United States Supreme Court's decision.

South Carolina has taken steps to use its power to abolish its public schools as a means of defying the highest court of the land. The Congress cannot ignore these obvious attacks upon the authority of the Federal Government.

We are face to face today with four reactions to the Supreme Court decision by school districts in hitherto segregated parts of the United States: school districts that have integrated, school districts that are integrating, school districts that have said that they will integrate, and school districts which by punitive and prohibitive laws will not integrate and are in absolute defiance of the Supreme Court.

My amendment will help all those school districts that have integrated, are integrating, or have stated that they will integrate, by granting Federal funds to any school district that is obeying the law of the land. Do we or do we not bear responsibility for the manner in which Federal money is spent? My amendment does not punish anyone or penalize anyone. It only restrains the Federal Government from being a partner to the crime of defiance of law and order. It will help those school districts within States that are integrating even though the majority of the districts of the State have not yet integrated. Furthermore, to show the absolute fairness of my approach, I have another amendment which will hold in escrow the funds that would have been allocated to school districts that have not integrated, and will hold those funds in escrow until the last year of the bill. If by then they decide to integrate, then they will receive the accumulated funds. This cannot be called extremism. By the time the Kelley bill comes to an end, 7 years will have passed since the first Supreme Court decision. Is not 7 years long enough for anyone to make up his mind whether or not to obey the law of the land?

Let us stop strangling America by semantics. The Supreme Court said to move "with all deliberate speed." You may say go slow, but at least that means go. It does not mean that because you integrate in Muscogee, Okla., that that is

an excuse for not integrating in Jackson, Miss. The law of the land must be obeyed everywhere at the same time, not in any particular area.

Without my amendment what would happen?

First. It would mean nullification by Congress of the integration decision of the Supreme Court.

Second. It would mean a gain for the Soviet amongst the nations of Asia and Africa.

Third. It might well thrust the Negro people of America into a massive, passive resistance program such as is succeeding so successfully in Montgomery, Ala., and Tallahassee, Fla.

Fourth. It would hold the United States and democracy up to ridicule before the whole world as a nation of pretense and preachments but not practices.

The majority of the Members of the Republican side of this House have agreed to vote in favor of the Powell amendment. In other words, if the Powell amendment is defeated, it will mean that it has been defeated by my own fellow-Democrats. What a tragedy it would be if the party of Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Harry S. Truman became in 1956 the anti-Civil Rights Party of reaction in the field of civil liberties.

Some people say this is an unholy alliance between people who want to kill the bill and people who want civil rights. This I do not believe. The Rules Committee itself produced an unholy alliance during the past week and brought forth two bills that never would have been brought out otherwise. If the northern Democrats will stand up and vote in the great tradition of Roosevelt and Truman, then the Powell amendment will be part of this bill, and more than that, this bill will be passed by the House of Representatives.

But then comes the great cry: If we do have the Powell amendment, then the bill will be killed in the Senate. This is sheer and utter stupidity. If the Powell amendment is attached to this bill, it will not come before the Senate. What will happen is that in the other House, the bill that is already before them does not contain the Powell amendment, it will be substituted after the enacting clause of this bill. In other words, all the talk in newspapers and in the Halls of Congress about a certain filibuster in the Senate is absolutely ridiculous, sheer nonsense, propaganda, and in some instances, downright lies. The bill that the Senate will consider will be the bill of Senator LISTER HILL not the bill of Congressman AUGUSTINE KELLEY.

There are those who say that maybe an amendment on the style of mine will be introduced in the Senate. If so, that has nothing to do with what we do here, for with or without the Powell amendment in the House, such an amendment is possible in the Senate. Finally, if the Senate does pass the Federal aid to education bill without the Powell amendment, the bills will then go to conference. So let us for once and for all stop these lies about my amendment will kill the bill.

May I emphasize that the Powell amendment is distinctly not racial. Above all, it is not political. It is an

amendment aimed at upholding the moral grandeur of the law of our land at a time in history when our Nation needs every single son and daughter to stand in a solid phalanx and give a burnished witness that this is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

What about our little children?

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I shall gladly support the Kelley bill (H. R. 7535) as reported by the committee.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably little disagreement on the basic need for Federal aid to education, which H. R. 7535 would provide. Simply stated, we are confronted with the question of whether or not we are going to provide our young people with an adequate public-school system. There may be other side issues, but that remains the basic problem.

We are agreed as to the necessity of a free public-school system. That principle was long ago accepted as being the foundation on which our Republic rests.

We all accept as one of our responsibilities as citizens the fact that we must provide adequate educational facilities for our young people. The question then becomes: Are we doing an adequate job in this respect? Almost any educator, almost any parent who has children of school age would be able to give you the answer.

The sad fact is that we are failing to provide classrooms to take care of our ever-increasing school-age population. At the present rate of construction, it is estimated that we will be short 176,000 classrooms by 1959. This would mean inadequate facilities for approximately 4½ million children.

School districts across the Nation have been staging an uphill battle to build the classrooms they need. They have managed, in most cases without aid from the Federal Government, to keep pace with the growing numbers of children reaching school age. But it has been impossible to reduce the backlog, resulting from depression and war, of desperately needed new school buildings.

Federal aid to the States now should help them get over the hump in catching up with essential school construction. That is what H. R. 7535 is designed to accomplish. It is a vital shot in the arm which will enable hard-pressed school districts to catch up. Once the backlog of needed classroom space is overcome, then local school districts can continue from there in keeping pace with the year-to-year increase in enrollment. And Federal aid to education is not a brandnew principle being trotted out by the "socializers." Federal aid to education has been approved in various forms since 1785.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to Federal control of education. If I believed that H. R. 7535 would result in Federal control of education I would oppose it. But I do not believe that Federal control of schools would follow Federal aid for construction of the classrooms which are needed now by school districts all across the Nation.

H. R. 7535 is in the national interest. This bill will not be of great help in my

particular district, but I believe the people I represent are ready to assume their share of responsibility in bringing our schools up to the highest possible standards.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOYLE].

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, I shall support the worthy objectives of the Kelley bill as it was reported unanimously by the committee, subject to the approval of the amendments, as stated by the gentleman from West Virginia, [Mr. BAILEY], and any other which may be found essential.

Some of the reasons why I shall support this bill are as follows:

First. While I was a member for some time of the California State Board of Education, before I first came to Congress about 10 years ago, I obtained a statewide knowledge of some of the school needs in my native State of California. And, even then, there was rapidly increasing need of substantially more schoolroom construction in parts of the State; especially in metropolitan areas.

Second. In the great 23d Congressional District which I have the honor and responsibility of representing in this my fifth term in this legislative body, I have received many communications from groups of citizens; school officials and individual citizens stating it was their opinion, that the Kelley bill, which is now before us, should be enacted into law. Comparably, I have received but very, very few communications opposed to the enactment of the Kelley bill.

Furthermore, when I was recently home in connection with the June 5 primary vote, I asked the opinion of a goodly number of representative citizens about the need for Federal aid for schoolroom construction and their reply was almost unanimous in the affirmative. Furthermore, I know that several of the school districts in the great 23d Congressional District have communicated to me directly, that they need Federal aid for schoolroom construction as promptly as possible, on account of the present existing lack of schoolroom capacity, together with the sharp increase in school population from school term to school term. Therefore, my belief is that the benefits of this bill will definitely and materially be a benefit to the existing and increasing schoolroom need in the great 23d District which I represent. In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I well remember that when I was on the State board of education in California and the question of Federal aid to schools was before us, at that time Dr. Dexter, who was then the superintendent of public instruction in California, communicated to me that California favored Federal aid at that time even though California itself might not receive a single cent of Federal money. This position, he explained to me, was taken by California school authorities because so many thousands of children were annually coming to California with their parents from other States, where the school programs and facilities were so comparatively less than those in California, that it was found necessary when these thousands

of children came from such States to virtually reeducate and retrain them in California schools. This, he explained, not only took much time but cost large sums of California tax money.

Third. The report of our House Committee on Education, from which this Kelley bill emanated, was unanimous after extended and thorough hearings, which demonstrated by factual information and evidence that there is a nationwide need for thousands of additional classrooms to be added to our nationwide school facilities at the earliest possible date; lest we wish to further be responsible for a school generation partially illiterate and unschooled on account of less than full-day sessions and on account of continuing lack of school-room facilities. I do not choose to be a party to having any American child, regardless of place of birth, or color, or economic status, having less than a fair chance for schooling. I want every child to have fair schooling when he should.

Fourth. Granting that some of the States are presently doing a fair job in this connection, it appears fairly clear to me that Federal aid, as a temporary measure only, for the 4-year term of the Kelley bill, is the only prompt, effective solution. Granting also that it would be a good judgment and a sound expenditure of tax money for the States to themselves assume their primary responsibility, many of the States have not done so; many of them apparently will not promptly do so. Therefore, Federal aid for this 4-year term of the Kelley bill is both necessary and the only sensible, effective present solution to an immediate problem. I know, for instance, that some of the allegedly poorer States are expending more for their schools than is the average in the United States, which is 2.7 percent. For instance, Alabama spends 2.85 percent, Arkansas 3.02 percent, and Mississippi 3.16 percent. And, of course, the ability of States varies.

Fifth. This bill should act as a normal welcome stimulant to the States which need the use of it. And, of course, under section 103 on page 3 of the bill, only those States which desire to accept the benefits of the bill and apply through their own State educational agencies can benefit under the bill. As I read all of section 103, it appears crystal clear to me, that the respective State educational agencies in the States applying, shall be the sole agencies for administering this beneficent plan within their respective States. The States provide for establishment of standards on their own State level; they provide opportunities for hearing before the State educational agencies for the respective school district desiring to obtain Federal aid for their respective school districts; and funds paid to the State under this bill will be expended solely for school facilities and classroom construction projects, which must be first approved by their respective school educational agencies; the fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will also expressly be under the control of State educational agencies. It appears to me that the committee has deliberately endeavored to make it technically true, as well as a practical fact that there shall be no Federal

control of local educational policies. This is as it should be. I could not favor the bill if it was otherwise.

Sixth. Also, by the raising of Federal funds for this worthy proposal in the various States, the Federal Government taxing ability and authority, which does not depend primarily on the real estate tax, as do most of the State tax systems, for their school funds, will be logically tapping sources of income other than the comparatively meager assets of low income brackets. This should not be objectionable to any taxpayer who wishes that all American children shall have a fair opportunity for adequate schooling. A child grown into adulthood as an illiterate in any substantial manner is an economic liability and not an asset. Every American child, each day, is becoming either an asset or a liability to our American way of life.

Seventh. With the application of this Federal aid to those States which apply for it on the basis of their respective needs for it, some goodly percentage of school funds from the various local school districts will thereby be released from the needs of local schoolroom construction, to the existing local school needs of increased teachers salaries; maintenance of school property; transportation needs, and other worthy local school needs which cannot now be met and for which there is no local sources of obtaining the funds.

Eighth. And on this last point, which I here mention, the time limit of this debate will only permit me to urge to your attention the fact that our beloved Nation is now engaged in a war with Soviet communism which has been described as the war of the classroom; the war of ideas. Knowing that you agree with me, it resolves itself into a contest between the nations of the world in the field of education; in the training of the mind and the spirit, it is primarily a civilian task rather than preparation for war. This is essentially true because the chief nations of the world already have, or will have, available hydrogen bombs and atomic power and energy. Thus the Soviet Union has recently changed its course of conduct and changed its method of attack against our Nation as a capitalistic nation. It is far outdistancing us in the field of engineers, scientists, chemists, and so forth. And, school children are attending Soviet schools longer hours each day and more days a week than do ours in the United States. They offer substantial inducements and bonuses for especially talented youths to proceed further with their education. We must not let any nation pass us in this regard lest we pay an assured penalty of falling behind as a Nation which is not only founded upon spiritual values, but which preaches that our Nation is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, as Abraham Lincoln, our citizen of the world, stated in his lifetime.

May I again urge that time is the essence of this need. There is no time to delay. The problem is before us and this present bill is the best solution, with its proposed amendments, which we will apparently have opportunity to enact this session. Let us do the thing that is

necessary and just and right and sound in behalf of our children and the United States. We must do this because as the children of our Nation are today, so will our Nation be tomorrow.

Another thing, our national defense is involved. Too much so in fact because thousands of lads who would otherwise be qualified to respond to the call of duty from the military, fail to qualify on account of their illiteracy. This means lack of schooling in the fields of simple spelling, language, and even simple arithmetic. I urge enactment.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 7535. To my way of thinking, I feel that this pending legislation is the most important that has been before us this year. By enacting this legislation, we would not be setting any precedents—we would only be fulfilling our obligation to the school-children in this country.

Federal aid to education antedates the Constitution. There is no longer a question whether Federal aid for school construction is necessary. We must accept the fact that America's school systems are in serious trouble throughout the country. The Nation's need for more classrooms cannot be doubted. This has been proven by nationwide surveys and long congressional hearings.

Ever since I came to Congress, bills have been introduced providing Federal aid for school construction. A subcommittee in the 82d Congress conducted extended hearings on various bills that were pending before the committee at that time and reported a bill to the full committee in 1952.

While these studies have been taking place, and the problem getting a little bigger all the time, we have been confronted with groups that have undertaken to minimize the needs of the schools for classrooms. The crisis has been on us a long time. We have seen it mount each year. We know that there are not enough schools being built each year. We know each year more and more youngsters are ready for school. Facing a situation of this kind, we must recognize that the school classroom shortage has become so great that it is now a Federal responsibility to aid the States and localities.

All studies made by interested school groups and by the Government point up the serious shortage of adequate school buildings in which to house our school-children. All of this exists in the most modernized up-to-date country in the world. Here we spend billions for defense and practically nothing for our children. There could come a day when guided missiles, superbombers, and atomic-powered submarines will all be useless if we do not see fit to help the States provide adequate classrooms for the Nation's children. Money spent on defense weapons could be wasted taxpayers' money if we do not give our children the chance for education in safe, adequate surroundings. Much of our defense is replaced and replenished every few years, but in many cases, our youngsters are forced to attend schools

in buildings which if they were military equipment would have been abandoned after World War I. We cannot afford to spend what we do for defense and not do more than we have for our schoolchildren.

We must not forget the fact that our children are the Nation's most important investment. I am hoping that this Congress will assume its responsibility to the children of this Nation and no longer listen to these arguments attempting to minimize the needs and delay action any further. This is emergency legislation and it should be treated as such. We all know that there are enough glaring examples of inadequate schools throughout the length and breadth of this land to destroy the need for more adequate financing.

Before our Constitution, the Congress of the Confederation set aside public lands in the Northwest Territory for the endowment of the common schools. Later, the Congress of the United States continued to appropriate public lands for this purpose as new States were admitted. In more recent years, the Congress has enacted various other provisions for Federal aid to education in the States, including, since 1917, direct support of vocational education in the schools. The Supreme Court has already ruled on legislation of this type and there is no question about its legality.

I want to tell you something about Kentucky's classroom needs, which are critical. Dr. Robert Martin, superintendent of public instruction of Kentucky, described our dilemma to me in a recent letter. He writes that—

Many boards of education are looking forward with hopeful anticipation to the enactment of this bill into law as an aid in the solution of their problems in school housing.

Superintendent Martin emphasizes that—

These problems in Kentucky are gradually increasing annually. A number of districts which have voted special taxes find that they have obligated all the income from the taxes and are still much in need of school buildings and equipment.

According to Dr. Martin, a comprehensive study of Kentucky's need for school facilities has been completed recently. He reports that—

This study shows that by 1960 we will have an estimated need of 10,600 new instruction rooms as additions to present buildings or as a part of more than 400 new school centers. In addition to these instructional spaces, the new buildings in each center will need central heat, indoor toilets, sewage disposal, lunchrooms and fixed handwashing facilities. The survey shows that in the old buildings of the State, more than 200,000 children now attend school in buildings with no central heat and with no inside toilets. More than 175,000 children attend school in buildings with no handwashing facilities available.

Superintendent Martin points out further that—

The cost of needed school building facilities by 1960 will be approximately \$350 million. The total amount that could be raised in this State for this purpose from local districts' funds, under the laws in force at the time the study was completed, was approximately \$162 million. This left a deficit of approximately \$188 million to be supplied

from some other source. The last session of the Legislature provided for capital outlay purposes approximately \$5 million annually from State sources as a part of its appropriation to support the Foundation Program of the State. It would take some 40 years for this sum to provide facilities so badly needed today.

This, I submit, is only the picture of classroom needs for Kentucky, but when you multiply the facts, they add up to one solution—there must be Federal aid for school construction. We must provide enough schools to supply the demands of an expanding Nation.

Since the 81st Congress, and especially in the 82d Congress, when I was a member of the subcommittee studying school classroom shortages, I have favored and supported a formula for aid which was based on giving aid where there was the greatest need. No one can object to a distribution formula which rightly takes into consideration the income of the people of the State, the number of children to be educated, and the effort the people are making to finance education from their own resources. This formula was developed in the general Federal aid bills which passed the Senate by an overwhelming vote in both the 79th and 80th Congresses.

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] and myself sponsored a similar formula in school construction bills pending in the 84th Congress but our suggestions were turned down by the committee in favor of the flat grant formula. It was not until after the President came out for the Hill formula, which is now termed the Eisenhower formula, that additional support was obtained. I have always thought that this principle was most equitable because it is simply a distribution based on need. We all know that it often happens that a very considerable part of the wealth taxed in one State under our Federal system may actually be created by people working in another State. Personally, I feel that the Hill formula will emerge from the Senate, but I am willing to go along with the committee and support the flat grant formula of the Kelley bill.

There is another issue which is obstructing the path and has no place in this legislation. I see no reason for an amendment guaranteeing that no Federal money would go to States with segregated schools. It is not needed because the Supreme Court's decision has said what the law of the land is on this subject. The Court also recognized the complications surrounding integration when it provided in the decision that the Federal court system would oversee the integration process. The decision announced that integration should take place with deliberate speed. This language does not mean integration overnight. It could easily mean over a period of years depending upon the facts in different sections of the country. We do not need to have other Federal legislation concerning integration. We certainly do not need any other legislation in this bill. I for one have confidence in the Supreme Court decisions. These decisions guarantee to every individual affected equal protection of the laws.

The adoption of the Powell amendment would have but one purpose and that would be to kill this legislation for the remainder of this session of Congress. This would be a terrific blow to all the schoolchildren in this country after the committee has worked for more than 4 years in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Federal aid for school construction now is of very great importance if we are to give children an equal chance in the years ahead. As the old saying goes, "You don't help a fellow understand you by hitting him with a big stick just to prove you have the power." We should not further complicate this emergency legislation and hurt the future of our children. This school year there were over 2 million schoolchildren in excess of the normal capacity of the school buildings. Approximately 32 million pupils were enrolled in public, elementary, and secondary schools this year. We did not have enough classrooms in which to house them. How can we sit idly by and say in the face of the facts that this is not a national problem? I for one remain hopeful that we will defeat the Powell amendment and pass this legislation next week, and when we do that, we will let the people in this country know we are fulfilling our obligation to these unhoused schoolchildren.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON].

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I am strongly in favor of Federal aid for the construction of schools. I know of no more important problem confronting the country today.

For years, the construction of schools has not kept pace with the increase in population—probably from the fact that during the depression, World War II, the reconstruction period following World War II, and the Korean hostilities, school construction was at a standstill.

The birth rate of this country increased tremendously at the close of World War II. These children are now entering, in many cases, obsolete and overcrowded schools.

I have thought for some time that Federal assistance in financing the building of schools is a necessity. Certainly, it is becoming painfully evident that something must be done substantially beyond the present effort to house the rapidly rising population of our schools, particularly when present efforts—insufficient as they are—are putting a severe strain on the resources of many school communities.

My awareness of this situation has been sharpened from my years as a practicing lawyer, in which calling one is of necessity closely concerned with the affairs and problems of local communities. From that experience, I can see clearly the very real difficulty that local taxing units have in raising funds to build schools.

School housing conditions are distressing now, and, without some substantial remedy, they can only become worse. There is a continuing vigorous growth in our national population, but our school population is increasing more

than twice as fast as that of the Nation. At the same time, the cost of constructing school facilities has mounted even more sharply than the population figures.

The combination of those factors can have dire consequences to the well-being of the Nation for generations to come, unless positive steps are taken now. We must face up to this problem before educational deterioration sets in and brings social, political, and economic stagnation, before such regression destroys our traditional ideal of progress. To maintain the one tradition requires, I believe, that we forsake what may appear to have become another tradition: That school building costs be borne only by purely local revenues.

Up to now, most schools have had to be built with the proceeds of bond issues secured upon tax levies on the respective school communities. But, in Indiana, as elsewhere, the restriction imposed by the State constitution upon local bond indebtedness has set an inescapable limit on the construction of schools.

This was brought very vividly to my attention not long ago when a school building was destroyed by fire in one of the most wealthy communities in my district. Fire insurance was carried on this building and the proceeds of this insurance were realized after the fire. But building costs had so greatly increased that the insurance proceeds would not nearly cover the expense of replacing the building. Issuance of bonds to produce additional capital was necessary, but there the school authorities were balked by the constitutional restriction. There was simply no way in which this community could build its own school. Finally, a building was rented under the holding corporation act, which I will mention in a moment.

That situation arose, as I say in one of the wealthier communities of my district, where, except for the constitutional restriction, financial resources were available to support the building program. Unfortunately, many other communities in the State are troubled not merely by the legal difficulty, but also by the more basic handicap of inadequate resources.

For one or the other of these reasons, 46 percent of the schoolchildren of Indiana are housed in obsolete buildings. Forty-seven percent attend classes in fire-hazard buildings, and 62 percent of their classrooms are overcrowded. Some of the deficiencies could be met by rehabilitating existing buildings, but 28 percent of the pupils need new buildings.

The needed construction and renovation in Indiana would cost an estimated \$257 million of which \$183 million is unavailable from local resources. A 6-year Federal program of \$500 million in annual grants apportioned on a ratio of pupils per State would give Indiana about \$75 million. That figure being less than half of the State's deficiency in available resources, I think such a grant could hardly be called unreasonable.

I have outlined the situation in Indiana, where I think there is ample evidence of need for a Federal-assistance program, even in a State where the per capita income is higher than the national

average, and where per capita expenditures for school purposes likewise exceed the national average. I do not doubt that an even more desperate need can be demonstrated in the case of some others of the 48 States.

There has been no lack of efforts on the State level in Indiana to meet the problem of financing school construction. Perhaps the most extreme step was taken in legislation to establish a State school building authority—in effect a holding corporation. This authority was given power to issue bonds for the raising of capital to construct schoolhouses to be rented to local school communities.

A constitutional issue was promptly raised as to whether this was not a mere subterfuge to permit the local communities to get around the constitutional debt limitation. The holding corporation was finally held constitutional by the Indiana supreme court, although misgivings were expressed from the bench that the sole purpose of the legislation was to evade the State constitution. Even if such holding corporations were upheld in all the States—and they have been struck down in at least two States—they still suffer a failing in that many local communities could not afford even to rent school buildings once they were constructed.

The device of tax accumulation in capital funds has also been inaugurated in Indiana. But the defect in such a plan is that, while an appreciable amount of capital might eventually be created for building purposes, such funds cannot be drawn upon for current construction needs.

I do not think anyone concerned with the future of our country can seriously dispute the need for prompt and effective steps to meet the real national crisis in school housing. The only question is: How shall these schools be financed? It is clear that they cannot be paid for from current tax revenues. So, the money for them must be borrowed. True, if the Federal Government provides direct grants, the public debt might be increased. But the indebtedness of people throughout the Nation would be increased just as surely if funds were borrowed by State or local governments for these purposes. Hence, I think the debt question is no argument against a Federal program.

If these expenditures for schools were to be supported by taxes levied by local governments, the burden would fall on real estate, on which, I believe, taxes are already too high. Under modern conditions, much of our wealth is held in forms other than real property, which was not the case in earlier times when taxes were first levied for the support of schools. The Federal Government, with its power to tax income and various other revenue sources, can bear the school building burden better and distribute it much more equitably than can the local governments which must look primarily to real estate for their revenues.

I believe that, regardless of where a child is born in this country, he is entitled to a good education. I believe that he is entitled to go to school in a building that would not be condemned

as a slum if used as a residence, or abated as a nuisance if used as a factory.

I believe that any nation which can spend \$40 billion a year for defense and \$4 billion a year for foreign aid can afford to provide a half-million dollars per year for schoolhouses. I believe that a nation which spent billions to crack the atom and unleash a potential for destroying civilization can spend a sizable fraction of that sum to promote civilization.

Federal help for schools is by no means a new concept. Portions of the public domain were set aside as "school lands" nearly a century ago. Schools were built by the WPA during the 1930's and the Federal Government made grants to schools during World War II and, in the postwar years, to "Federal-impact" areas having school problems.

In none of these cases has the Federal Government interfered with the affairs of the local school communities, and I see no likelihood of such interference under H. R. 7535.

When I first entered the House in the 81st Congress, I proposed school construction legislation and Chairman BARDEN, of the Education and Labor Committee, joined me in requesting the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress to prepare a report on the needs and possibilities for the financing of school construction. This report was submitted to the Education and Labor Committee in 1950. Its contents, as revised up to date from time to time, furnished a basis for dealing with this problem.

In every session of Congress, of which I have been a Member, I have introduced legislation providing for Federal aid for school construction. I am certainly in favor of the Kelley bill, and I hope that this legislation will be enacted, whereby the Government can assist in the construction of schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, for 9 years of my life I was a schoolteacher. For 6 of those years I was superintendent of a public school system. I loved it. I received many rich rewards from my experiences and associations in the teaching profession. Today I enjoy the friendships that came to me while I was a schoolteacher, and I enjoy also the things I understand and know better now because I was a schoolteacher. Also, as are most of you in this body, I am a father of school-age children. I love them. I am concerned about their future. So I am not going to be even slightly modest in extolling my own enthusiastic interest and concern about public school education.

A critical shortage of adequate classrooms does exist. There is also a grave deficiency, more critical, in my opinion, than the classroom inconveniences, in qualified teachers. But this bill we have today, this composition, a legalistic monstrosity, is too heavily endowed with misleading statements and political promises to hope for any relief from crowded schoolrooms, and it certainly ignores the more tragic of our shortages,

a sufficient number of qualified school-teachers dedicated to teaching the fundamentals of formal education.

Why is this bill misleading? Page 1, line 6, in the very beginning, states that the Congress finds that after sustained and vigorous efforts on the part of the State and local subdivisions of government they still cannot meet the demands for classrooms.

The hearings which were recorded and which were held before this committee certainly do not justify this Congress finding any such thing. The hearings of the committee justify the finding of the shortage of classrooms, but in no instance—not a State of the 48 States nor a Territory showed any evidence or brought in any facts to sustain the charge that they cannot do the job that needs to be done at home. I will say more about that later.

Now where are the political promises? Title I authorizes \$400 million a year for school construction. That is only a drop in the bucket to what is needed. If the classrooms that we say are needed must be built, \$400 million a year for 4 years is simply a drop in the bucket, but it is enough and just enough to get the camel's nose under the tent. Look—Alabama gets a measly \$9 million, Arkansas gets \$5 million, Kentucky \$8 million, and West Virginia only \$5 million, and Oklahoma \$6 million and so on down the line with paltry sums to each State. What do we do to get this amount of money? We just simply abdicate our responsibility as States and surrender to the United States Commissioner of Education the complete power, if he desires to exercise the authority given in this bill, over our public schools. Moreover, we must raise an equal amount at home to match him while he is doing the dictating. No Federal officer short of the President of these United States has ever sought or been offered more direct, more discretionary or more implied powers than those now proposed for a United States Commissioner of Education. He says, "Just let me get my fingers in your business—that is all I want." It is true that an amendment will be proposed to correct some of this by the distinguished chairman of the committee. I think the amendment would help. I still think he would have too much power even with that amendment. So much for title I and the broadest power ever offered to any Federal officer.

Title II and title III are a continuation of political promises. In those titles, there is absolutely nothing but pure political hokum. There is no other way to understand it. Again he says in this title, "Just let me get my fingers on your public schools." Can we no longer take at face value the commitment of the citizens of the local school districts to levy taxes and pay off the school bonds that they have voted? Can we no more accept at face value the pledge of a State legislative body to appropriate the money to pay off debentures issued under authority flowing from the vote of its members? This bill says, "No"—that we cannot depend on those things. This bill says, "Just let me, the Commissioner of Education of the United States

endorse your note and fix your interest rate and tell you when to pay." But to "give you the service I shall have a voice in the operation of your schools." That is all that title I, title II, and title III amount to—pure political hokum. Why? Do we not all know that the bonds of a school district once voted, or that the revenue certificates of a State financing authority with legislative approval of its State legislature can be and are today sold at higher premiums and lower interest rates usually than is our own Federal Government paper?

Now about the States that have moved against this problem. There are five—Indiana, Maine, North Dakota, Pennsylvania, and my own State of Georgia. About the first four named, I know none of the details as to the method or progress. But, when the progress in Georgia is recited, I believe with all modesty, that the argument about these poor little old States not being able to solve these problems will be shot to shreds. What have we done in Georgia? We, first, are paying more than 53 percent of our entire State revenue to our educational program. That is the first thing. We have a minimum foundation program which provides \$200 per teacher for capital outlay. We have set up \$14,500,000 annually for construction.

Since 1951, the year of the creation of the Georgia State School Building Authority, the State of Georgia alone, exclusive of local districts and counties, has spent \$91,218,059.68 on school construction; classrooms. Altogether, local and State, and other, we have spent \$274 million, and we built 6,401 new classrooms as of January 31, this year.

Presently we are spending \$3 million per month, and the 1956 estimate for spending is \$35,865,518. That, my friends, from a State classified by some as a poor State, but not by me, and with a per capita income of \$600 less than the national average. That, from a State that many would call a poor State, spending that kind of money on public school education; and then come here and tell me that many States in this Union, with a per capita income above the average, cannot spend it; some States spend as little as 12.5 percent of their income on public education.

One thing further. So many are giving lip service to the matter of local control of public schools. So many believe that in order for a public school program to function properly control must be kept as close to home as possible. I not only believe that. I subscribe to it, and I am going to fight for it. But so many are just giving lip service.

Let us see what the White House Conference found. Among other things, it said, "We want maintenance and operation funds as soon as we can get it."

This bill means the beginning of the end of local controls for public schools, the Powell amendment notwithstanding. It is not necessary. You have heard distinguished lawyers and eminent former jurists stand here and tell you that it means nothing; that they can withhold funds even without the so-called Powell amendment.

One final thing: I believe that this National Government, great and strong as it is, derives its strength and grew from one thing only. That is the strength of the 48 States making the Nation. I can think of a great giant oak with the roots spread out all around, bringing up strength from the soil from all around it, growing into a magnificent tree. I can think of this Federal Government in the same way. It derives its strength from the States only. When we commence to get into the nerve center of those States, the public school system, we are beginning to destroy that. They will atrophy. No longer will we have anything approaching the public school programs we have today because all our responsibilities and authority have shifted to Washington and a United States Commission of Education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield.

Mr. McCONNELL. Each of the States having the ability to take care of their school program, do they not also have the ability to take care of their library services?

Mr. LANDRUM. Well now, the gentleman well knows that the Library Services bill is in no way analogous to this. The gentleman knows that the public library program is not founded upon the same principles as the public school program. I believe the gentleman also knows that we are dealing with an entirely different field, and if my friend from Pennsylvania will permit me a bit of levity, can he not also, as a Member of Congress, permit one slight inconsistency along the line we travel?

Mr. McCONNELL. I would certainly permit the gentleman that inconsistency. I was wondering about this thought, that some who are advocating the Library Services legislation might be doing wrong because the States do have the power to take care of their own needs.

Mr. LANDRUM. In reply to the gentleman's inquiry I will say this: The gentleman from Georgia is not concerned about the money; the gentleman from Georgia does not complain that the amount of money is too much to be spent on public education; the gentleman from Georgia is concerned only with how that money is spent, by whom it is spent, and who develops the program for which it is spent.

Mr. McCONNELL. Of course I have some feeling regarding the Library Services legislation. I do not know of any State that could not raise money for libraries and books within its own borders. I do not see why the Government should have to furnish that service, although I know there are many who disagree with me. But I cannot see where this school construction problem is not also a companion one with the Library Services inasmuch as both require State plans be submitted to the Commissioner of Education before grants can be made.

Mr. LANDRUM. I could not agree with my dear friend on that. I say to him again that the State Library Services bill is something in another field. I believe it has no relationship to this bill at all and absolutely all control is left to the State.

Mr. WINSTEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANDRUM. I yield.

Mr. WINSTEAD. I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman for the fine statement he has made and hate to interrupt him, but one thing that concerns me about the Federal approach to this problem is the matter of the Government purchase of bonds. We have some very poor counties in the State of Mississippi, yet even during the depression I do not know of any district in that State that ever voted a bond issue that could not sell its bonds at some reasonable figure; and it seems to me there is less justification for this feature which permits the Federal Government to walk in and set the interest rates and purchase the bonds.

Mr. LANDRUM. One further point, and I think this is important to the people who continue to think and talk only about this business of segregation: We are rich in tradition in Georgia and the Southland. We are going to stick to those traditions. We are going to keep respect among the races, but we are also going to continue to keep our segregated schools, and I want the Members to know this, that in this great building program in Georgia more than 50 percent, more than 50 percent of the amount that has been spent for schools has been spent for Negro schools; and in two systems, Lee County, Ga., the whole amount, 100 percent, has been spent for colored schools, and in Quitman City schools the whole amount of money allotted was spent on Negro schools, and in not one instance were the schools built for the colored children of any lower standard than those built for the whites.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question of the gentleman from Mississippi regarding the purchase of bonds, he mentions that various school districts can sell their bonds successfully. I say where that is true I see no reason for the Federal Government to purchase those bonds. This is merely an effort to support the incentive idea of this program; in other words, if the district has no general financial background and is without established credit standing because it has not been in the bond market before, it will have its chance to sell its bonds to the Federal Government at a more reasonable figure than it could sell them on the market. That is the only reason for it, and there is no reason why an educational group would sell the bonds to the Federal Government if they could float them in the open market at a figure of 2 or 3 percent.

Mr. WINSTEAD. The point I am making is that I have known of school districts in my section, even poor districts and in depression times which if they voted a bond issue for the construction of school buildings could sell them on the market at a reasonable rate. Cer-

tainly I see no reason for the Federal Government to get into the bond buying end of this thing. I think there is far greater merit to the grant section of the bill than there is to the lending section, because I believe the school districts will have no difficulty selling their bonds on the market. As I say, I represent one of the poorest counties in the State of Mississippi, yet I have never seen the occasion when they could not find a sale for their bonds for school construction.

It is hard for me to believe that there is not a district in the whole United States but what can float its bonds and get a buyer at a reasonable rate of interest without the Federal Government launching out into this phase of it.

Mr. McCONNELL. If the gentleman will go over the bond market and the sales prices and yields of some of these bonds of school districts throughout the country, he will discover many of them have to borrow money for school purposes at a higher rate than under the bond purchase plan proposal of the bill under consideration.

The gentleman says he prefers grants. What we are trying to do is avoid too much of the grant idea. We are trying to encourage the local districts and the States to do the job themselves. That is the central purpose of this bill. Most remarks have been addressed to the grant section of it, which is not the main part of the bill.

Mr. WINSTEAD. What rate of interest? Do you have a minimum and maximum rate of interest?

Mr. McCONNELL. How the rate of interest is determined is mentioned in the bill. It is determined by the Secretary of the Treasury who specifies the rate of interest applicable to the calendar quarter during which obligations are purchased plus three-eighths of 1 percent.

The applicable rate shall be determined by the Secretary by estimating the average yield to maturity on the basis of daily closing market bid quotations of prices during the month preceding such calendar quarter, on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of 15 or more years. I would say that at the present time the rate of interest for bond purchases would be about 3½ percent.

Mr. WINSTEAD. That would result in every district in the United States selling its bonds to the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I am intensely interested in this bill but not being a member of the Committee on Education and Labor I feel I should not take up too much time in expressing my views. However, I want to point out the situation in California which has made this bill a very important one to our people.

We have had an unprecedented influx of people into California since the days of the Dust Bowl, when the distressed farmers in Arkansas and Oklahoma, in particular, started to move into California.

Soon thereafter we had persons from the Middle West and the Southwest move into California to work in the air-

craft and shipbuilding plants during the middle and late thirties when we were building up our military potential as the menace of a war by Germany faced us.

The net result of all this has been that for about 30 years there has been an influx of people into California which has averaged about 1,000 a day and the migration has continued down to this very moment.

We need help now because many of the school districts, while they have a great many people, including children, living in them, do not have enough tax capacity to raise the money needed to provide proper classrooms for the pupils.

Our need was recognized by the committee because 3 years ago one of our school districts was given \$145,000 to use in completing a large elementary school in the north end of Stockton, Calif.

To show you how this continual influx of migrants has been going I need but remind you that following the 1950 census California was given 7 additional Congressmen. We went from 23 to 30 and it now looks as though we will have a similar increase following reapportionment after the 1960 census.

Our State is liberal in its spending for school purposes. We have a sales tax of 3½ percent that goes for education. Despite all this many children are in crowded rooms, which are unsatisfactory for the proper training of our pupils.

Our children are our greatest future asset. We need well trained students if they as adults are to cope with the complex situations in the world today. California requires high standards for its teachers. My personal contact with many teachers has convinced me of their devotion and their competence in teaching our pupils.

We hope the plan that finally emerges for Federal assistance in providing more classrooms will be completely free from any Federal control. That seems to be the aim of all the members of the Education and Labor Committee.

California will pay every dollar required of it under the law that will emerge.

In addition, our cities and counties contribute liberally toward the proper type schooling and appropriate teaching for our children.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COON].

Mr. COON. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Education and Labor Committee, I have listened to several months of testimony on this bill to provide Federal aid for school construction. After giving the matter a great deal of thought and study, I feel that the proponents of this legislation did not justify the need for it.

School construction certainly is necessary and is a worthy project. I want to do all that we can for the good of our schoolchildren. However, this fact does not prove to me that the Federal Government should embark on a huge new program of Federal aid. Education and school construction are primary responsibilities of our States and our local communities. In cases where local school districts cannot undertake necessary construction, it seems to me that

the problem should and can be solved through State action. Present State equalization programs can be extended and perfected. Additional taxes can be levied where necessary.

People speak of rich States and poor States. In these present good times, I do not think that any State is so poor that it cannot afford to build adequate schools and provide its children with excellent school facilities.

Now a Federal-aid program is not a gift program insofar as the taxpayers are concerned. All of us pay for these programs through the present high burden of Federal taxes and we should remember that. The Federal Government cannot give you anything until it first takes it from you.

In addition to the matter of cost, we are faced with a situation where more and more power is being centralized in Washington, and at the same time, the rights and responsibilities of the States and communities are shrinking. In the matter of school legislation, I think this is a field where we should make a special effort to resist this trend.

Several thousand of my constituents answered a public opinion poll which I mailed to them this year. In reading their answers, I discovered an overwhelming sentiment against any Federal program of aid to the States for building schools that would mean any Federal controls.

In this bill, as in others of the same type, this will be a foot in the door to start actual Federal control. It seems to me that the history of Federal programs of grants in aid shows that they keep expanding and becoming more expensive. As they expand, more and more conditions become attached to the grants. These conditions lead to stronger and stronger Federal control.

I think that we should continue to determine our educational programs and policies at State and local levels. I do not ever want to see the time come when bureaucrats in Washington will dictate to us how we should run our schools.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, we are confronting today a major problem. The facts and statistics have been stated and restated. The arguments for and against Federal aid for school construction have been argued and reargued. It is in many ways a complex and perplexing problem. Yet, in the last analysis, the problem before us is a very simple one and the challenge we must meet is a very clear one.

We must build schools or condemn millions of children to second-rate education in crowded and often dangerous buildings. And only help to the local communities by the Federal Government can do the job that must be done, in time to meet the need.

These are the facts, in their simplest terms. If there are those who still dispute them, then let them answer the rollcall of parents, teachers, businessmen, labor spokesmen, civic groups, government officials—the rollcall of responsible people from the towns and the countryside, all over America, who know

these facts at first hand, and who have presented them, over and over, till only those can deny them who are determined not to face them. Support for this bill spans every community and every walk of life in America. Let me remind you of the groups and organizations through which the American people, in overwhelming numbers, are urging this action to save our schools. Here are just a few of those who have supported the principle of this legislation in committee hearings last year, or in public statements:

American Jewish Congress.
American Association of University Women.
American Federation of Labor.
National Education Association.
Georgia School Boards Association.
Council of Chief State School Officers.
California Teachers Association.
National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.
Spokesmen for Children.
North Carolina State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
National Parent-Teachers' Association.
American Association of School Administrators.
The Governor of New York.
New Jersey Education Association.
Congress of Industrial Organizations.
Superintendent of Schools, Lewis County, W. Va.
Oregon Education Association.
National Farmers' Union.
Los Angeles City Superintendent of Schools.
Minnesota State Commissioner of Education.
Jewish War Veterans.
Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction.
American Federation of Teachers.
Georgia State Superintendent of Schools.
American Vocational Association.
United Mine Workers.
American Institute of Architects.
United Auto Workers-CIO.
American Home Economics Association.
American Library Association.
American Parents Committee.
AMVETS.
Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees.
Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen.
Friends Committee on National Legislation.
International Association of Machinists.
National Association of Secretaries of State Teachers Associations.
National Congress of Colored Parents and Teachers.
National Council of Jewish Women.
National Council on Schoolhouse Construction.
Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen.
Textile Workers' Union of America.

This is, of course, only part of those who are on record in support of the objectives of this legislation. There are many others—school officials, civic groups, private citizens—that I cannot take the time to list. In the past year, as this issue has been debated, the list

of newspapers, civic groups, and others endorsing this objective has become almost endless.

I do not list these many names simply for the record. They have made their own record, more eloquently than I could state it. But I mention them now to raise the essential question, Why is this great cross section of Americans so concerned with the need for Federal aid for schools? The answer, I think, is clear. They know the facts. They have seen overcrowded schools, old and dilapidated schools, children jammed in basements, children on half sessions. They have faced the problems of trying to finance desperately needed new schools out of limited and already overtaxed local resources. And having strained local resources to build new schools, they have seen them filled up, overflowing, almost before they were completed, so that the job must start all over again.

Let me briefly describe the situation in just one school district, in my own county, right now. This is the Lynch school district, in Multnomah County, Ore. In just 4 years their enrollment has doubled. This fall they will have nearly 200 more students than they have space for. Now they are building seven new classrooms. But by a year from now, even with these new classrooms, their increase in enrollment will again give them more than 200 students for whom they will not have the classrooms. Their resources have been exhausted by current construction. They have completely used up their legal bonding capacity. In the past year and a half alone they have floated two bond issues. They have absolutely no other resources under the law on which they can draw. They are using storerooms for libraries, basements for music rooms, storerooms for offices, a boiler room for a teachers' workroom.

Where are these people to turn for help? Will "theories" about what the States ought to be able to do help them? Will those theories build schools? Are these people likely to be frightened by these cries of Federal domination, because they provide money for bricks and mortar—when without Federal aid, they won't even have classrooms to worry about?

The case I have stated is just one case and it is from a State, I am proud to say, that has done an outstanding job and made an outstanding effort for its schools. Yet we, in Oregon, have this problem and I know that, in other States, it is far worse. Every member here has similar cases in his own State. That is why these representatives of millions of Americans who live with these facts, have come before us favoring Federal aid for school construction. That is why they are not frightened away by theoretical objections. Theories will not build schools, will not solve our problems. If we withhold this help now, because in "theory" the States should be able to do the job, or because of "theories" about Federal domination, we will end up with theoretical classes in theoretical buildings but the neglected and poorly educated children will be very real indeed.

We hear a lot of fine generalities from those who oppose this legislation. They talk about the horrors of Federal domination—they see camels' noses under every tent and they are absolutely certain that one thing leads to another. I sometimes wonder if these men, in 1790, would not have opposed a Federal Post Office on the argument it would lead to Federal control of letter writing.

Some of these people came in before the Education and Labor Committee and opposed Federal aid because, they said, they were handling the problem at the local level. A spokesman for a State "taxpayers' association" came in and told us his State "is paying its own way and is solving its school-construction problems" and assured us that they would "use the taxing power of the whole State" to meet their school needs. But a little later, a representative of the State Teachers Association from the same State testified before us and told us they did need help. Furthermore, he said the earlier witness, who wanted this problem left to the State has not helped us a bit at the State level. Some people who oppose Federal aid for schools say let the States do it. Then they go home and do everything they can to prevent State help—because of fear of State control or because the local district ought to do it or some other reason. So little gets done and we find ourselves in the situation we are in today.

They tell us that Federal funds will lead to Federal domination of the schools. But we have been spending Federal funds to help the States with their schools for many years, and we do not have Federal domination. Do we have Federal control of schools through the school lunch program, the school milk program, the vocational education program for which we just this week approved \$29 million? Do we have it through the impacted areas program? I was in the education field for many years. I never once saw any indication of Federal control. We will not have Federal control of schools as long as we have responsible, alert citizens who care about their schools and who are prepared to protect them against Federal, State, or any other domination.

Can anyone seriously go through the long list of organizations I have cited, all of whom support this bill, and say these people are supporting Federal domination, or that, caring as they do about education, they and millions of other Americans like them would support the bill that would in any way allow Federal control.

I appeal today to those who deal in rigid generalities and theoretical dogmas to lay aside these prejudgments and these generalities, and judge this issue in light of the facts. We need schools. Our children desperately need them if we are not to have a generation of half-educated young people whose first lesson in school was how to sit two to a seat and in some cases how to duck the crumbling masonry. To build the schools we need when we need them, and that means now, the Federal Government will have to help. These are the facts. They have been recorded, beyond argument, by the long list of Americans I have cited, who know and care about this problem.

Can we not consider this problem in a practical, calm, and factual way, leaving aside for the moment these fine, theoretical arguments? Can we not go ahead to build these schools? Our children 10 years from now will never know whether the schoolroom they sat in was built with Federal or State money. They will be educated as well in one room as another. They will not be tainted by the money that built the room. But if they have decent schoolrooms and the chance for a decent education, wherever the money came from, I believe they will be grateful. I hope we can give them that chance.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, at the outset I wish to express my very strong and enthusiastic support for the bill which we are considering today, H. R. 7535, the Kelley school construction bill. And particularly, Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment my able colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose name the bill bears. His able leadership has been largely responsible for the excellent measure which now lies before you for action. I wish to express my keen pleasure in working together with him in committee on this bill. The opportunity to associate with the gentlemen in this constructive way for the welfare of our Nation and our Nation's children is one of the rewarding experiences of public life as the representative of the good citizens of the Fourth New Jersey Congressional District.

Now, my purpose in rising, Mr. Chairman, is to focus our minds' eyes upon one particular provision of the bill—upon section 107 of the bill.

This section makes sure that wages prevailing in the locality are paid to laborers and mechanics who build the schools which our children will occupy. I am 100 percent in favor of this proposition.

This prevailing wage principle is nothing new in our Government—either State or Federal. Just the other day I had some research done on State prevailing wage laws covering public construction. I found that 31 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and the District of Columbia all have these laws similar to the Federal Davis-Bacon Act. My own State of New Jersey has an excellent law. But our law does not apply to federally assisted projects for the reason that these projects should be subject to an overall Federal prevailing wage law. So we in New Jersey are counting on the Congress to fill up the gap by enacting section 107 as it now stands in the bill.

I have also found, Mr. Chairman, that adoption of a prevailing wage principle has not been a partisan issue over the years. As a matter of fact, the original Davis-Bacon Act was first introduced in this House in 1926 by the late Congressman Robert Low Bacon, a distinguished Republican Representative from the State of New York. In the Senate the bill was first introduced by the late Senator James Davis, former Secretary of Labor under three Republican Presidents. It was first passed in 1931 under

a Republican administration and by a Republican Congress.

Later on, in 1935, the Davis-Bacon Act was considerably strengthened and improved under a Democratic administration and by a Democratic Congress. Today, both Democrats and Republicans are supporting the extension of the Davis-Bacon Act to apply to federally assisted school construction under this bill. Section 107 of the bill, the section which applies the Davis-Bacon Act is absolutely identical to the section in the education bill endorsed by President Eisenhower and sponsored in the Senate by Senator SMITH of my own State. We received strong bipartisan support for this section in committee and I am confident that the section now receives the strong bipartisan support and approval of a very large majority of this House today.

A very sound principle underlies the prevailing wage requirements affirmed by this bill. It is simply this: The very great purchasing power of the Federal Government—the vast expenditure of public moneys shall not be used in a manner to depress the wage structure of the community. A striking example of the opposite of this principle was given by Congressman Bacon when, many years ago, he explained on the floor of this House what prompted him to introduce the original bill.

He told a true story occurring in his own community where the United States Government asked for bids on a new hospital. Out-of-State contractors underbid all New York State contractors on this job because the out-of-State men could ignore the comparatively high labor standards then prevailing in the New York area but the local contractors could not.

What was the result?

The successful bidder brought in some thousand laborers at low wages, crowding out the local labor supply. Local conditions were entirely disrupted. I am told that these out-of-State laborers were later cast off by the contractor at the end of the job. They became a relief burden to the people of New York—and a continuing threat to the jobs of craftsmen in that locality.

Now this is a condition which we cannot afford to have repeated where the massive expenditure of Federal funds is involved. Today the volume of new construction put in place runs somewhere over 40 billions of dollars year after year. The amount of federally supported construction runs about 14 billions each year—or more than a third of our total annual dollar volume. Let's just stop and think for a minute about the meaning of these figures, in terms of production, of employment, of payrolls, in the mines and mills, the shops and factories of America.

No really accurate figures are available to demonstrate the immense impact of the construction industry on the Nation's welfare. It is enough to say that prosperity or depression in the construction industry can make the difference between prosperity and depression for our national economy as a whole, and the great and increasing role

of the Federal Government in the construction industry carries with it a very heavy burden of responsibility. Any person or agency promoting or assisting at least a third of all new construction put in place in a single year, year after year, has what amounts to a public duty to use this enormous economic power in the best interests of all segments of our economy.

A false or a misguided step here or there can help to undermine the very standards which have been an important part of our prosperity and of our growth.

Here is where the matter of prevailing wages comes in. In 1954, there were around 900,000 craftsmen employed on work assisted by the Federal Government.

About the same number were employed last year. The payrolls on this work run annually into the billions of dollars. Now, these dollars are not only put to work to provide the journeymen and his family with the necessities and a few of the modest luxuries of life.

They do much more than that; they help us buy the products of the farmer, the merchant, and the manufacturer.

They help these businessmen support their families and meet their payrolls, and thus in turn support even more workers in other lines of endeavor and to meet their own modest demands. We can easily see the serious hidden effects which can follow any serious cuts in wages on construction assisted by the Federal Government. Unless the Government makes sure that wages on this construction are in line with going rates and practices, the contracts for construction can easily go to the firm whose labor costs are below the standards set for that particular area.

These cut rates present ruthless competition for contractors who pay the going or prevailing rate. Inevitably they serve to undermine the going rate. They bring about the gradual collapse of the entire wage structure, not only on Government work, but on all construction in any community where this kind of unfair competition is allowed to exist. Then, there can follow a kind of chain reaction, a broad downward movement of wages and prices in the community, a slowing down in the business of all who depend upon the construction work for making a living.

The exact effects are hard to measure; but they are easy to describe. I think I have said enough to give you the idea that wage practices on Government construction can, in my judgment, provide the opening wedge for a full-blown depression in this land of ours.

In one area after another the Federal Government has faced up to this challenging responsibility. We passed the Davis-Bacon Act 25 years ago to apply to public works. In those days the great bulk of Federal construction expenditures was for public works of the United States. Gradually over the years, however, the character of Federal construction outlays has changed. More and more, we have been tending to aid and support construction by local public and private agencies. Today almost \$10 billion of the \$14 billion total involves federally assisted construction rather than

direct construction on Federal public works.

As each new authorizing statute has been passed, the Congress has frequently taken action to make sure that construction undertaken with Federal money is carried out in accordance with the prevailing-wage principle of the Davis-Bacon Act.

Since the middle thirties, for example, housing has been a fundamental concern of the Federal Government—slum clearance, urban renewal, low-rent public housing, defense housing, multitype dwellings for rental purposes, and so on.

The Federal Government has not undertaken this housing itself. Instead it has assisted construction through loans, grants, or mortgage insurance.

Nevertheless, to each one of these programs the Congress has extended the prevailing wage principle. I refer to the United States Housing Act of 1937; the Housing Act of 1949; the Defense Housing and Community Facilities and Service Act of 1951; the National Housing Act, as amended.

Building airports, planning and building hospitals, even planning and building schools—building done through State funds matching Federal grants—the very subject of the Kelley bill—all these have been very properly subjected to the prevailing wage principle by applying the Davis-Bacon Act to State and local construction aided by Federal financing. I refer to the Federal Airport Act; the Hospital Survey and Construction Act; and the School Survey and Construction Act.

Just recently we passed a multibillion-dollar public highway bill which places the finances of the Federal Government behind a vast network of new nationwide superhighways. These will be State-built roads but the Davis-Bacon Act will apply to them whenever the moneys are mingled for construction of interstate highways.

We can readily see, Mr. Chairman, that there is broad basis—ample precedent for applying the Davis-Bacon Act to State and local construction financed in part by local funds. The fact that Federal financing is also involved presents long recognized and very valid grounds for seeing that Federal funds are not improperly used to destroy existing labor standards.

Now, let us turn to the particular program presented to us by the Kelley bill. We have here a 4-year, multibillion-dollar school construction proposal.

With the State and Federal authorities cooperating on a 50-50 basis, over \$3 million will be spent at a rate of \$800 million a year. This will mean about 57,000 more jobs each year for building and construction tradesmen. At this rate it is clear, Mr. Chairman, that this program will have a very substantial impact upon the economy of the whole country. If we do not make sure that these schools are built in line with the standards prevailing in the community, we may very likely see a repetition in one instance after another of the very evils that Congressman Bacon found in his hometown. We may see the wage structures in our communities completely disrupted by cheap outside labor. We may

see Federal funds used on one contract after another where the lowest bidder gets the job solely because he is able to undercut the labor costs of the hometown contractors.

This will mean one city after another in which the wages and purchasing power can be seriously undermined with surprisingly disastrous results to local business and industry. It certainly can help to start the very kind of downward spiral that results in depressions on a national basis.

These are very real possibilities which the committee considered carefully when it decided to apply the Davis-Bacon Act to school construction under this bill. But they were not the only considerations. One other very important factor served to persuade us that this provision is an indispensable item in the bill.

It is this.

The wage-cutting contractor—the out-of-State contractor who chisels on his labor costs—not only gets poor workmen and poor workmanship but he is apt to use defective or poorly made equipment and materials wherever he can.

In particular, I have in mind an investigation made some years ago at a time when the housing agencies did not take any direct action to secure compliance with prevailing wage requirements. In 11 States alone workers were deprived of more than \$600,000 worth of unpaid wages due to violations of the act.

This will give a rough idea of what can happen when there are no prevailing wage standards at all to curb the chiseler.

But the investigation showed much more than that. It also showed that faulty building goes hand in hand with chiseling on wages. In case after case, where workers were underpaid the building structure itself was inferior.

Mr. Chairman, we are embarking on a nationwide program under which more than \$1,500,000,000 of taxpayers' money in the Federal Treasury can be converted into much needed schools for our children. I am sure we all want to get our money's worth in sound and lasting structures. I am sure we all want to see safe and sanitary school buildings of lasting quality.

The prevailing wage provisions of section 107 are a guarantee to the Federal Government that we will obtain the qualified craftsmen in every community to build our schools because these provisions guarantee the going rate paid to these craftsmen in each and every community. Poor workmanship due to poorly paid and inferior workers can be avoided by the fair and effective use of this provision. The quality of the work will meet requirements. The rate of construction will be in time with the best standards. The taxpayer and his children will receive the best product which his money can buy.

I think it is rather obvious, Mr. Chairman, that the local school construction with Federal funds under this bill is as much a national problem of concern to the Federal Government as the building of a local hospital with Federal funds in Congressman Bacon's district 30 years ago. Both impose a clear responsibility—a duty to act. The Congress first

took the required action back in 1931. We took the same type of action when we of the committee voted to recommend section 107 to the House for passage. As I have stated before, I am sure that a very large majority of this body will see the wisdom of our action and give overwhelming approval to this aspect of the school construction bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, may I say at the outset I would like to commend and congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for his calm and logical analysis of the amendment which he proposes to place before this body at the proper time. I believe that those who will reread it and study it will find that it is almost unanswerable. Certainly in the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky when he said he was opposed to the Powell amendment because of the fact that the Supreme Court had not set or given any time limitation to the implementation of the recent Supreme Court decision and that, therefore, the 4-year life of the Kelley bill would mean that it was not applicable, logic has disappeared. We must remember the fact that not only on this floor, but also in legislative action in some States it has been made very clear that it is not a question of time but a frank statement that never will an effort be made to live up to the Supreme Court decision. It is that, I believe, which we must face as responsible Members of this House. Therefore, as we reread the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I think that they will remain as completely unanswerable, except for the understandable position taken by those who are determined that this Supreme Court decision shall not remain the law of the land. It is because of this unyielding stand that we urge the adoption of the Powell amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hear a great deal about the fact that States like my own State of California and the State of New York ought not to support Federal aid for schools because we are so well able to take care of our own needs. These people seem to believe, and many of them have said so, that education has no interstate character—that each State needs to be concerned with its own residents alone and with the children of no other State.

I am sorry to say that with the single exception of one outstanding member, Mrs. Georgiana Hardy, the school board of my home city of Los Angeles has resolved on such a point of view. But I must remind these Californians of something that they, as residents of this progressive and growing State, know better than probably any other people in America. That fact is—the people who live in any one State of the Union today may have been born and educated in nearly any and every other State in the Union. America is on the move today, and great numbers have moved into California and other States. They make

their homes and their livings in California, and they cast their votes in California. We never ask our neighbors where they came from or how adequate their educations were before they move into our State. But it would be most shortsighted to believe that we have no stake in the educations that these people and their children may receive before coming to California. I think it is quite clear that we have an interest in the education being given today to the children of every State in the Nation.

As a Representative from California, which has grown faster than perhaps any other State in the country in the last few years, I could emphasize and document this point at great length. However, I would prefer to spend the time allotted to me in dealing with another point of interest to the people of my district and all districts which has, I am afraid, so far received far too little attention, and which will help to explain my deep interest in this Federal-aid measure.

The argument is often made by those who oppose Federal assistance for education to the States that both the Federal taxes and the State taxes must be paid by the same people, and that there is, therefore, no reason for letting the

Federal Government use its tax powers to raise money for schools.

The most important answer to this argument, an answer that is all too often overlooked, is that the Federal tax system does not tax the same people in the same way as do the systems under which the States raise their tax revenue. Studies submitted to the Joint Economic Committee have shown in detail what we all know in general, that the Federal system places far less burden on the lower-income families of our Nation than do the various State tax systems.

For example, in 1954, those families whose incomes were below \$5,000 per year paid 26½ percent of the Federal taxes; however, they paid 42 percent of the State and local taxes collected that year.

For those families whose incomes were below \$3,000 per year, the difference is even more marked. These families paid 8 percent of the Federal taxes; they paid almost twice that share—15.5 percent—of the State and local taxes on which our schools now depend.

I submit for the RECORD one table taken from such a study, to show how the effect of the Federal taxes compares with effect of these State and local taxes, by income group:

Estimated distribution of tax payments for 1954

[Percent of total yield contributed by income brackets]

	Spending unit income brackets (thousands of dollars)								
	0 to \$2,000	\$2,000 to \$3,000	\$3,000 to \$4,000	\$4,000 to \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$7,500	\$7,500 to \$10,000	Over \$10,000	Total	
FEDERAL TAXES									
(1) Personal income tax.....	1.6	3.7	8.0	10.2	28.3	13.9	34.3	100	
(2) Estate and gift taxes.....							100.0	100	
(3) Corporate profits tax.....	3.3	4.5	6.3	6.8	15.0	6.9	57.1	100	
(4) Excises.....	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100	
(5) Customs.....	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100	
(6) Social-insurance contribution.....	6.8	10.3	17.9	18.5	28.6	8.6	9.1	100	
(7) Total.....	3.7	5.6	9.7	10.9	24.4	10.7	35.0	100	
(8) Without social-insurance contribution.....	3.2	4.9	8.5	9.8	23.9	11.0	38.7	100	
STATE AND LOCAL TAXES									
(9) Personal income tax.....	.2	2.3	6.0	7.2	22.0	12.7	49.5	100	
(10) Inheritance and gift taxes.....							100.0	100	
(11) Corporate profits tax.....	3.3	4.6	6.4	6.8	15.0	6.9	56.9	100	
(12) Excise and sales taxes.....	8.2	9.8	14.4	14.8	28.2	10.3	14.3	100	
(13) Property.....	7.0	8.4	13.0	13.9	25.7	10.0	22.1	100	
(14) Social-insurance contribution.....	4.7	8.8	13.2	18.8	30.8	11.5	12.1	100	
(15) Total.....	6.9	8.5	13.0	13.9	26.3	10.1	21.3	100	
(16) Without social-insurance contribution.....	7.0	8.5	12.9	13.6	26.0	10.0	21.9	100	
ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT									
(17) Total.....	4.6	6.4	10.6	11.8	25.0	10.5	31.2	100	
(18) Without social-insurance contribution.....	4.3	6.0	9.8	10.9	24.5	10.7	33.8	100	

Source: The Incidence of the Tax Structure and Its Effects on Consumption, Richard A. Musgrave, University of Michigan; Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability, papers submitted by panelists appearing before the Subcommittee on Tax Policy, Joint Committee on the Economic Report, Nov. 9, 1955.

The reason for this difference lies mainly in the fact that no State can make the same use of the personal income tax and the tax on corporate profits that the Federal Government has made of these taxes. It is the Federal Government, far more than even the most favored States, that can reach the most fortunate and wealthiest people in our country, and ask them to assume their share of the cost of educating our children. In 1955, 15 States had no corporation profits tax at all, and 17 States had no personal income tax. Thirteen of the States had neither a tax on per-

sonal nor on corporate incomes, and many of the others got only a very small part of their revenue from these taxes.

Up until the time of the depression, the major source of money for schools was the local property tax. The local property owner carried nearly all the cost of providing the basic education for our children.

In 1929, the local school districts provided 83 percent of the money for schools, while the States paid only 17 percent of the cost of public education.

In the 1930 depression, the States had to relieve the property owner of some

part of this burden. The States did assume a larger share of the cost of paying for schools; they adopted sales taxes to provide the revenue.

In the 1953-54 school year, the States put up more than 37 percent of the money spent for schools, more than twice their predepression share, and by this time, the States were getting almost 60 percent of their tax revenue out of sales and similar taxes, instead of the very small, nominal use they had made of these taxes before the depression.

The result is that the States and the local school districts are forced to raise the money—not just for schools but for all State services—in great measure through property taxes and through sales taxes which bear unduly on those families which have the lowest incomes to begin with. By permitting the Federal tax system to raise even the small amount of the money here being proposed, we would be giving those families at least this small protection against further erosion of their buying power through these particular taxes.

The situation that I am describing is not unique to a few of our States; there is not one State in this Nation which can do as well as Congress can in placing the tax burden for the schools that are immediately needed on those best able to bear it.

In supporting this Federal aid measure, I am, in addition to other fundamental reasons, seeking to protect the buying power and the living standards of the lowest income families of my State of California. But the same program will protect the same group of families in the other 47 States as well.

These are the people who most need and deserve our help; helping them, we are protecting the market which they provide and on which American prosperity depends.

Let me talk for just a few minutes about the families whose incomes are below \$6,000 per year. They make up more than two-thirds of our families.

The State and local tax systems, as they were constituted in 1954, would tax these families \$1.60 when the Federal system would tax them a dollar. It is that additional 60 cents of burdensome taxation that I am trying to avoid. Federal aid for schools would save the under-\$3,000 families in my State of California between \$2 and \$2.5 million for each billion dollars in our Federal-aid program. Under the Kelley bill, which would provide \$1.6 billion in 4 years, the saving could run as high as \$3 to \$4 million for these families, which need the buying power so much.

Certainly, I understand that the total amount of Federal tax raised in California would be greater than the amount of Federal aid we would receive. But California is a wealthy State. I say this not in pride, but in thankfulness for the blessings we have received. In 1953, when the national per capita income was \$1,707, the per capita income in California was \$2,039. I am not surprised, nor am I shocked, that Federal taxes would take a small part of the income of our wealthiest people and our corporations

to provide for the children of the lowest income families—our neighbors and fellow Americans—in other parts of the country.

I am glad to support a bill that will help provide schools for American children. I am particularly glad to support it, knowing that I am at the same time helping the lowest income families in California, as well as in every other State of the Union by doing so.

I want to emphasize that the lowest income groups in practically every State will save millions of dollars if the Kelley bill is passed. This will be true, not alone in the States where the average income is low; it will be true, too, in my State and in the big industrial States like Ohio, Illinois, and Michigan.

I have studied the figures. I have compared the amount of money that will be paid by the people in the various income brackets in each State under these different conditions:

First. The burden on these people if the tax revenues of the Federal Government are used to provide a billion dollars of Federal aid for schools; and

Second. The burden on these same people if each of the States were to provide, out of its own revenues, the same amount of money that would otherwise come from the Federal-aid program.

Let me give you a few examples of the benefits that will come to the lowest income families from a Federal-aid program, like this one we are discussing:

In the State of Georgia, the average per capita income is unfortunately below the national average. This bill would help the people of Georgia, even those in the middle-income brackets. But the people who need help the most, those whose incomes are below \$5,000 per year, would save about \$8 million in taxes for each billion dollars of aid that we might provide for the schoolchildren of America. The Kelley bill would save these people nearly \$13 million. This is purchasing power that these people can use for the necessities of life. We will be helping not only these families, but those whose business depends on their purchases.

Illinois is a wealthy State, but it too has low-income families. Our proposal to aid Illinois schools, along with the rest of the country, will save approximately \$4 million for the families in Illinois whose incomes are below \$5,000 per year for each billion dollars of Federal aid. The savings under the Kelley bill should run as high as \$6 million for these families.

Mississippi has a very low per capita income, less than half the national average in 1953. If Mississippi were to raise, through its own tax system, the money to which it would be entitled under a Federal-aid program of a billion dollars, the under \$5,000 group of families would pay \$6,500,000 more in State taxes than they would pay if the Federal Government financed the program.

But, so would this same group of families in Michigan pay \$6,500,000 more in State taxes to raise the amount of money which Michigan would get in Federal aid from such a program. Again, under the Kelley bill, the savings would be

greater—approximately \$10 million for this group in each of the States. Here are some of these facts in table form:

Michigan

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections... \$48.2
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 43.2

Income group	How Federal tax of \$48.2 million would be distributed in Michigan	How Michigan tax of \$43.2 million would be distributed	Difference
Under \$3,000.....	\$4.0	\$7.5	+\$3.5
\$3,000 to \$5,000.....	9.0	12.3	+3.0
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	11.5	12.0	+.5
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	5.0	4.5	-.5
Over \$10,000.....	18.5	7.0	-11.5
Total.....	48.2	43.2	-5.0

Ohio

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections... \$58.0
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 50.5

Income group	How Federal tax of \$58 million would be distributed in Ohio	How Ohio tax of \$50.5 million would be distributed	Difference
Under \$3,000.....	\$4.5	\$8.5	+\$4.0
\$3,000 to \$5,000.....	10.5	14.5	+4.0
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	13.5	14.0	+.5
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	6.5	5.5	-1.0
Over \$10,000.....	23.0	8.0	-15.0
Total.....	58.0	50.5	-7.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in Ohio, \$2,012; national average, \$1,707.

Georgia

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections... \$13.5
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 27.0

Income group	How Federal tax of \$13.5 million would be distributed in Georgia	How Georgia tax of \$27 million would be distributed	Difference
Under \$3,000.....	\$1.1	\$4.4	+\$3.3
\$3,000 to \$5,000.....	2.7	7.5	+4.8
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	3.2	7.2	+4.0
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	1.5	2.9	+1.4
Over \$10,000.....	5.0	5.0	-----
Total.....	13.5	27.0	+13.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in Georgia \$1,184; national average, \$1,707.

California

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections... \$94.5
Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 66.0

Income group	How Federal tax of \$94.5 million would be distributed in California	How California tax of \$66 million would be distributed	Difference
Under \$3,000.....	\$7.5	\$10.0	+\$2.5
\$3,000 to \$5,000.....	16.7	16.7	-----
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	22.0	17.0	-.5
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	10.0	6.5	-3.5
Over \$10,000.....	38.3	15.8	-22.5
Total.....	94.5	66.0	-28.5

NOTE.—Per capita income in California \$2,039 (rank 7), national average \$1,707.

Mississippi

[In millions]

Federal tax, per billion dollars of tax collections.... \$4.20
 Share of a billion dollars of school aid (flat amount per child)..... 17.65

Income group	How Federal tax of \$4.20 million would be distributed in Mississippi	How Mississippi tax of \$17.65 million would be distributed	Difference
Under \$3,000.....	\$0.40	\$2.85	+\$2.5
\$3,000 to \$5,000.....	.80	4.80	+4.0
\$5,000 to \$7,500.....	1.00	4.50	+3.5
\$7,500 to \$10,000.....	.50	2.00	+1.5
Over \$10,000.....	1.50	3.50	+2.0
Total.....	4.20	17.65	+13.50

NOTE.—Per capita income in Mississippi \$834, national average \$1,707.

I will not burden this body with additional figures. I will, however, ask the important question to which these figures lead. That question is: What defensible reason can there be for not passing this bill; how can we justify refusing to give the people whose incomes are low, and whose purchasing power is crucial, this protection? Are we turning down this proposal because of unfounded fears about States' rights—fears that in this case will mean that the wealthiest families in each State will escape paying their rightful share of the cost of the schools our children need?

No one is suggesting that the Federal Government build all the schools that are needed, or that we raise all the money through Federal taxes. It is this slight measure of relief, important to the lower income families out of proportion to its total significance in the economy, that we are being asked to provide. I hope we can take advantage of the opportunity that is ours. By the passage of this bill we take a vital step of insuring that all American children, no matter where the accident of their birth, shall have reasonably adequate school facilities.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. Are there any taxes that residents of the State of California do not pay whether it be corporate, income, sales, or any kind of tax?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I will be glad to put in the Record the exact figures to show why they have not, in California, the same kind of income-tax law the Federal Government has. However, if you will examine the two laws you will see that even in California the State income-tax law bears more heavily on those in the lower income brackets.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman is going to put those facts in the Record?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Yes; I am.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. DIXON].

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I want to state my position on Federal aid to schools as follows.

I am opposed to Federal aid for the maintenance and operation of our schools largely on account of the danger of Federal control. On the other hand

I favor Federal aid for school construction only but as a last resort because the danger from any Federal control is slight and that danger exists only during the planning and construction period. When the building is turned over to the local authorities there can be no more Federal control.

I favor helping only those States which need help and only in proportion to their need. That is why I favor S. 2905, the Senate bill. It has a strong equalization factor. For example with an allotment of \$250 million under the provisions of S. 2905, the two poorest States would receive \$11,393,000 and \$11,317,000 respectively, whereas by an allotment of \$400 million under the Kelley bill these same States would receive only \$5,731,000 and \$5,266,000. In other words, the Senate version would give these two States nearly double the money with 38 percent less burden on the taxpayers.

Then again, I am in favor of the incentive factor found in S. 2905 and not found in the Kelley bill. By this method, needy States are helped in proportion to their effort to help themselves.

I favor Federal aid for school construction only as a temporary expedient to tide us over the present crisis. We faced a similar building crisis on the college level after World War II. The President's Commission on Higher Education, of which I was a member, was faced with the problem of finding room for 1½ million student stations. Federal aid was the answer. This aid was withdrawn as soon as the emergency was met. Likewise we had Federal aid under the GI bill of rights. This bill did not fasten itself upon us as a permanent policy. It was terminated a year ago last January 30.

My first choice then is S. 2905 and I shall support any amendments to the Kelley bill which incorporate the principles of the Senate version. My second choice is the Kelley bill. If both bills become so bogged down with extraneous social legislation that they cannot pass, then the third best thing would be to grant a flat sum of \$400 million to the States to match their funds for building purposes or better still to reduce the Federal income tax 1 percent to States that would add to their State income tax for school construction a like amount.

My reasons for supporting Federal aid are as follows:

First, there is a demonstrated need for more and better public school buildings.

This need has been so clearly brought out in the White House Conference Report and on the floor of the House today that I shall not take the time to dwell upon it further. I do ask, however, consent to extend my remarks in the Record immediately following this speech to include a statement of need in my own State.

The White House Conference Report says:

It appears that under present plans, only 2 or 3 States have been quoted as stating that they can meet their building needs for the next 5 years * * * Under present plans and time limitation stipulations, it seems

to be virtually impossible for most of the States to meet building needs.

The New York Times, under date of January 13, reports:

Fifty thousand new classrooms a year are needed just to keep up with the new faces that appear at the doors, and we have a deficit of some 300,000 classrooms. Nearly a million American children are being deprived of full educational opportunities.

Second, the need can be met more successfully through Federal aid.

While I favor Federal aid only as a last resort, and not at all for operating expenses, I am now convinced that the need for school buildings is so acute that we have reached this last resort.

Committee 5 of the White House Conference reporting on "How can we finance our schools, build and operate them?" states:

A substantial majority felt that some States do not have sufficient financial resources to take care of the essential needs of the schools. * * * The participants approved by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the proposition that the Federal Government should increase its financial participation in public education. Of those favoring such an increase, the overwhelming majority favored an increase in Federal funds for school building construction.

Third, Federal aid is the only effective solution. Opponents of Federal aid say:

The Federal Government is in debt nearly \$300 billion, while many of the States are out of debt. The States themselves are better prepared than the Federal Government to build their own school buildings.

I have the conviction that the wealth of the Nation, wherever it is, should be taxed to support the children of the Nation, wherever they are, and that our Government should go as far as it can to equalize educational opportunity for the children of all of the States. In this respect, the Senate bill is superior to the Kelley bill. Now the wealth per school child ranges greatly from State to State. The average State income per child in 1953 varies from \$3,537 in Arkansas, \$3,904 in Alabama to \$11,517 in New York, \$11,301 in Delaware, and \$11,110 in Connecticut. In other words, some States are almost four times as able to finance their schools as other States—White House Conference Report, table 6, page 67.

The average State spends 2.72 percent of the income of its citizens for education. Our poorest States, Alabama, Arkansas, and Georgia, already spend more than that; namely, 2.85 percent, 3.02 percent and 3.16 percent respectively, while Connecticut spends 1.9 percent. Apparently, Utah, a State with less than average wealth per school child, makes the greatest sacrifice for education in proportion to her wealth; namely, an expenditure of 4.2 percent—White House Conference Report, page 71, chart 5. New Mexico spends 4 percent and Oregon 4 percent.

Federal aid in situations of this sort is defensible for three reasons; namely, first, it is the only likely source of building funds; second, it relieves the householders from an increased tax on property for buildings at a time when almost

the entire burden of education in my State and other States has been saddled upon the property tax almost to the point of ruin—Federal funds, on the other hand, come mostly from income taxes and other less destructive sources of revenue; and third, in addition to the cost of new classroom facilities there will be an increase in operational costs of \$3 to \$5 million per year in the State which again must fall largely upon the local property tax. Furthermore, long before the building needs of the elementary and high schools are satisfactorily met, the rising tide of students will be reaching college and our problems will be fully as acute there as in the lower reaches of the school system.

Third, Federal aid to school construction is necessary for the protection of freedom. The cold war has developed into a war of the classrooms.

For a number of years, we have been hearing and reading about the cold war between the Communist East and the democratic West. Recently the nature of this war has greatly changed.

The all-important weapon is no longer the atomic nor the hydrogen bomb. The Soviets, as well as we, know that initiating full-scale nuclear warfare would bring upon themselves quick and sudden destruction. So the Soviet leaders have undertaken to beat us at our own game.

They have openly challenged us to a duel with a weapon which has been basically all-important through the centuries. This instrument, in different forms, has been often used by dictators to establish and extend their power. In other forms it has been used by republics to maintain their freedom from tyranny. This instrument is education.

In the words of former United States Senator and diplomat William Benton, the cold war has become the "war of the classrooms"—New York Times magazine, April 1, 1956, page 15. It has developed into an open competition for technological and scientific supremacy. The maintenance of our supremacy in science, technology, and other fields of knowledge essential to our national survival depends, of course, upon the improvement of our provisions for education.

Let us not be lulled into complacency by the delusion that maintenance of the superiority of our educational system is assured. Our newspapers and other sources of information are bringing us startling news of educational accomplishment behind the Iron Curtain.

For example, a recent article in Life magazine—Life, March 5, 1956, pages 31-36—pointed out that the Soviets are producing an elite generation of specialists "enormously dangerous to the West but so far little noticed by it." This and other sources have revealed that the Russians are showering unprecedented educational opportunities upon their youth in whom they have placed their hope for triumph over the West. Over half a million Soviet youth are already receiving college and university training in science and engineering; and the number of lower school pupils being pre-

pared for higher education in these fields is steadily growing.

According to reliable estimates, at the present rate, by 1960 Soviet specialists will far outnumber those of the United States—in the work cited. President Eisenhower recently drew attention to our national shortage of persons trained in medicine, teaching, nursing, science, engineering, and other fields—message to Congress on January 12, 1956.

A recent study financed by our National Academy of Sciences brought forth significant figures—Nicholas Dewitt, Soviet Professional Manpower, December 1955. It pointed out, for example, that in 1953 there were more than 5½ million persons with higher education in the United States as against only 2 million in the Soviet Union. However, the number of Soviet professionals who had completed higher education was somewhat greater than the number with similar training in the United States. The study revealed that the Soviets are strenuously exerting themselves to improve their whole educational system. In order to prepare such a large number of their youth for professional higher education they are building up their lower schools.

Russia today is going all out for the education of her youth. She is preparing two engineers to our one. She is winning over her youth by providing for them the finest hotels, the finest recreational centers and the finest schools. I am told that gifted youths meeting the requirements of the Communist Party are given free schooling on through the doctor's degree. Russia is cutting her military budget to build her education budget and reducing expenditures for adult activities in order to lavish money on youth. Can the United States afford to sit complacently by and watch such progress of the enemy?

Forty years ago, at least half the Soviet population was classed as illiterate. Today Russia has a 7-year primary school system rivaling our own, with nearly 100 percent enrollment. The secondary schools have developed accordingly, and in spite of labor shortages, practically all children from 7 to 17 are kept in school. Right now, authoritative sources indicate that the U. S. S. R. has already surpassed us in both number and percentage of students enrolled above the secondary level.

Russian students go to school 6 days a week, 10 months a year; discipline, study hours and curriculum follow a strict and rigid pattern. There is a strong concentration on basic subjects, and as the students advance, close to half their work is in science and mathematics, with little or no choice of electives.

There has been a great increase in what the Russians call the "thkhnikums," a type of vocational college which gives a 2½- or 4-year nonprofessional education to technicians, and one estimate places the number of these schools near 2,000.

Money has been no object in the great expansion of Russia's educational system. The new University of Moscow science building, for example, cost about

\$150 million, which is more than what the complete physical plants costs for many American universities.

The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy reports:

In 1954 we graduated only half as many college-trained specialists in engineering and science as we did in 1950. In the same year the Soviets turned out more than twice as many as we.

Allan Dulles, Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, recently warned that in this present decade the Soviet Union will graduate 1,200,000 university students in the basic physical sciences while we will graduate only 900,000.

Herbert Hoover said 4 years ago:

The United States with one-sixth the population of the world has 40 percent of the world's college graduates. Therein lies America's might and let no one shear us DeLilah-like of this strength.

How long will the United States retain this supremacy? Not very long unless there is an awakening here.

I heard Senator Thomas, the sponsor of the GI education bill, testify before the Senate Committee on Education during World War II that the States with 18-year-old compulsory school attendance laws qualified seven out of every 10 draftees while the States with the 14-year to 16-year-old compulsory school attendance laws had almost the reverse situation; namely, they had nearly 7 out of 10 draftees disqualified.

The Selective Service rejection rate of the States is to a great extent almost inversely in proportion to the amount of money spent on education. The poorest States average rejection rate was 48 percent, for educational deficiencies, in 1953, with an average rejection rate among all the States of 16.6 percent. The lowest rejection rate was Minnesota with 2.2 percent and Utah with 2.6 percent. These statistics show rather convincingly the close correlation between national safety and education.

Some opponents of the school bill coming from the more wealthy States ask, "Why should my State pay in so much more than we get out?" One good answer is because when we are at war every State should be able to provide its just quota of men which is impossible when some States have as high as 48 percent rejection for educational deficiencies and other States only 2.2 percent. Furthermore, the best investment the United States can make is to qualify every person possible not only for military service but for scientific, social, and economic and moral progress.

I recall the old fable of the fox and the wild boar, where the fox came upon the wild boar sharpening his teeth on a rock. "What are you doing that for?" asked the fox. "Because when the hounds are after me it's too late."

Fourth, the people have spoken out in favor of Federal aid for school construction.

The people of the United States spoke out in no uncertain terms for Federal aid for school buildings through the White House Conference at Washington, D. C., November 28-December 1, 1955. This conference was the culmi-

nation of more than 4,000 local and State conferences. From the thousands of participants in the State conferences, the State governor appointed 1,800 to attend the White House Conference. Official tabulation of occupations and professions of the 1,800 participants showed that for every educator—that is, teacher, administrator, or school board member—there were two noneducators present. Surely Congress cannot refuse to hear the voice of the people.

The White House Conference in its final report says: "This committee believes that Federal aid for school construction should be made available on a limited basis for all States and Territories and the District of Columbia to help overcome the present school building emergency."

As previously stated, the participants approved such aid by a vote of more than 2 to 1.

Let me summarize as follows: First, there is a need for Federal aid for school buildings to tide us over the present emergency. This need is impressive and has been demonstrated. Second, the need cannot be met successfully by local or State effort alone. Third, Federal aid is necessary for national safety and the protection of freedom. Fourth, the people have spoken.

This is a time for action in the interest of our national survival and the welfare of our Nation's children. Now is the time for us to amend and enact the Kelley bill providing Federal aid for school construction, or if it is not amended we should, in conference committee, substitute the Senate bill for the Kelley bill.

I am the child—all the world awaits my coming.

What I am today the world of tomorrow will be.

Give me, I pray you, those things

Which will make me a blessing to humanity.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Utah yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I congratulate the gentleman from Utah upon his splendid statement. Coming from a former college president and a member of the President's Commission on Higher Education, it is especially significant.

Mr. DIXON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. Do you not realize that if Federal grants-in-aid are made to the States and local districts and remove at least 50 percent of the burden of building additional classrooms, they will have a greater amount of local funds left, for instance, to pay for transportation costs, than if they have to assume all of that construction?

Mr. DIXON. Exactly, and that is the only source they can get it from.

Mr. BAILEY. So indirectly we are helping out another situation rather than the building situation without any Federal control.

Mr. DIXON. Without any control over the teachers or the textbooks or the course of study.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIXON. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Is it not true also that one of the reasons we have this problem is the centralization of the taxing power and the taxing fields in the Federal Government? If it were possible for us to go into a very definite tax study and yield up some of the fields of taxation which we have now entered to these States and local communities, would not the problem solve itself? But since we have not been able to do that, is not this just about the only thing we can do to make sure that the children get an education?

Mr. DIXON. Yes; that is why I am in favor, if we cannot pass one of these bills, of yielding 1 percent of Federal income tax to the States for the support of their schools.

THE UTAH SURVEY REPORT

Mr. Chairman, the research division of the Utah State Department of Education has recently completed a preliminary report of school finance problems in Utah for the next few years.

This study shows, rather dramatically, the magnitude of the problems which we must face in Utah in the next 5 years. After that, we can expect an even greater financial pinch, as our post-war baby crop reaches our colleges and universities.

The first significant increase in children came in 1942. These children are now in our junior high schools. They will be ready for college in about 1960. Because of the urgency of the elementary and secondary problem, I will mention only the school building problem in these grade levels.

The report shows that we can expect to spend between \$9 and \$12 million per year just to provide new classrooms for the increased numbers of children entering the Utah schools; in addition, we will need between \$64 and \$85 million to replace those buildings classified as poor and unsatisfactory by the recent State school building survey commission. Poor: If the score is below 500, the building is so inadequate that its continued use is hardly debatable. A building scoring 500 or above in this range may be used as a temporary expedient for a few years, but plans for its abandonment in the near future unquestionably should be made. Unsatisfactory: The building should be abandoned at the earliest possible time. This commission actually visited and scored the school buildings individually. These figures do not include any funds to renovate or remodel substandard buildings. To replace those classified by the commission as poor and unsatisfactory over a 5-year period, it would be necessary to spend between \$13 and \$17 million each year. If the replacement period is extended to 10 years, the annual expenditure would be between \$6.4 and \$8.5 million.

The following data will give you a summary picture of the magnitude of our

problem in Utah to provide needed classrooms:

	Minimum annual need	More realistic estimates
Annual cost to house increased enrollments.....	\$9,208,200	\$12,071,000
Annual cost to replace obsolete buildings in 10 years.....	6,434,400	8,586,000
Total annual cost of needed classrooms.....	15,642,600	20,657,000

We are now spending approximately \$13 to \$14 million annually for physical school facilities in Utah. To raise this money, many of the districts in Utah have bonded to their legal limit. For those districts that have no further bonding power, there is little hope of meeting their needs from present resources.

Assuming a figure half-way between the minimum annual need and a more realistic estimate figure—\$18,149,800—for the next several years, we will be required to increase our annual school building expenditures by about \$4 million.

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-six Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 84]

Adair	Fulton	O'Hara, Minn.
Anfuso	Gordon	Patman
Baker	Gray	Philbin
Barrett	Green, Pa.	Pillion
Bass, N. H.	Halleck	Powell
Bass, Tenn.	Harden	Preston
Bates	Harrison, Va.	Reece, Tenn.
Beamer	Harvey	Reed, N. Y.
Belcher	Hays, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Bell	Healey	Rutherford
Blatnik	Hillings	Sadlak
Bolton,	Hoffman, Ill.	St. George
Oliver P.	Holtzman	Saylor
Bray	Hull	Scott
Brooks, Tex.	James	Scrivner
Brownson	Jones, Mo.	Scudder
Burdick	Kee	Seely-Brown
Canfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Sheehan
Celler	Kilburn	Shelley
Chase	King, Calif.	Springer
Chatham	Kirwan	Stagers
Coudert	Lane	Taylor
Crumpacker	Lesinski	Thompson, La.
Cunningham	McCulloch	Thompson, Tex.
Curtis, Mo.	McDowell	Thornberry
Davidson	Mack, Wash.	Van Pelt
Davis, Ga.	Martin	Whitten
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Wickersham
Davis, Wis.	Meador	Wigglesworth
Dempsey	Miller, Md.	Wilson, Calif.
Dorn, N. Y.	Miller, N. Y.	Wilson, Ind.
Dorn, S. C.	Minshall	Withrow
Eberharter	Morano	Yates
Fallon	Morrison	Zelenko
Fino	Mumma	
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7535, to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, and

finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 316 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 2, 1956

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time to inquire of the majority leader concerning the program for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. The program for next week is as follows:

On Monday, we shall take up the Consent Calendar.

Then there are 12 suspensions. They are as follows:

H. R. 11683, to authorize increased officer strength of the Armed Forces.

H. R. 11575, authorizing the appointment of 3 Assistant Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force, for research and development.

H. R. 9555, to amend section 205 of the Food Control Act of 1948.

H. R. 10624, a bill relating to General Public Utilities Commission.

S. 3163, the Civil Aeronautics Act, for air carriers, Hawaii and Alaska.

H. R. 9801, to authorize a bridge, Panama Canal Zone.

H. R. 10433, relating to the training of personnel in the fishing industry.

H. R. 11554, relating to the private financing of passenger vessels.

H. R. 11122, relating to the charter of tankers.

H. R. 11570, relating to the Fisheries and Wildlife Act of 1956.

H. R. 10432, relating to travel expenses for students, Federal civil defense.

Then we shall have House Resolution 527, which is the rule on H. R. 11380, the bill relating to readjustment of postal rates. That is on the rule only.

We shall then continue with the bill now under consideration. If this bill is not disposed of on Monday, it will continue until disposed of.

On Tuesday the Private Calendar will be called.

After the disposition of the pending bill—if not on Monday, then on Tuesday—we take up the postal rate increase bill itself.

On Wednesday, July 4, there will be no session.

If there are any rollcalls asked for on Tuesday, they will be put over until Thursday, because there is an Oklahoma primary.

Thereafter, for the remainder of the week, after the disposition of the postal rate increase bill, we shall take up H. R. 10765, relating to the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

House Resolution 541, disapproving Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating to loan agencies.

H. R. 11695, to extend the school construction program in impacted areas.

H. R. 11132, to increase the borrowing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

There are the usual reservations. Conference reports may be brought up

at any time and any further program will be announced later.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. May I ask the majority leader: We expect on Thursday, following the recess over the 4th of July, to go on with the regular work at 12 o'clock; is that correct?

Mr. McCORMACK. We shall go on with the regular work, but please do not confine me to the hour of meeting. The hour of meeting on Thursday will be at 12 o'clock. I do not know yet what the hour for meeting will be on Friday.

I hope I have given this program so that it is clearly understood. The important thing is that, with the exception of the suspensions—and I think these are more or less noncontroversial—after the disposition of the bill presently under consideration the next order of business will be the postal increase bill. As to the other bills I have mentioned, we will bring up as many of them as we can.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Will the hour of meeting on Monday be 12 o'clock?

Mr. McCORMACK. 12 o'clock, yes.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to indicate there might be a Saturday session?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes, next week. Of course, I always keep a certain amount of flexibility on the program, but I strongly indicate that there may be a Saturday session next week, although I would not want to be bound by that statement.

Mr. LECOMPTE. No, of course not.

Mr. McCORMACK. There are some resolutions out of the Committee on House Administration which have a preferential status. They may be brought up Monday or Tuesday. There are several of them, but I have not put them on the program.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I understood from the Committee on Armed Services that the bill H. R. 5731, relating to substandard military housing, was also going to be brought up under suspension. It has already been granted a rule. I was told it was to be brought up under suspension on Monday, but I did not hear it read in the list of suspensions.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The Committee on Rules just granted that rule today.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. I was told by the committee the rule had been granted and it was going to be brought up under suspension, so as to avoid having full debate on it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very sorry to state to my friend from Florida that, although some Member may have spoken to me about it, my memory now is completely vacant as to anyone talking to me about it. Was the bill unanimously reported out of committee?

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Yes; it was.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I do not believe there is any objection to the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the Speaker and my friend from Illinois has no objection, suppose I also put that bill down for suspension. The more of these bills we can get rid of by suspension the better it is for all of us, where they are bills that have no strong opposition. If anything should arise concerning this bill between now and Monday, it is with the understanding that the bill will not be called up then.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALLEN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BARDEN. May I inquire of the majority leader if he can give us some indication how long these 11 or 12 suspensions will take on Monday? I have been asked probably a hundred times this afternoon if I thought we would get into the consideration of the school construction bill on Monday.

Mr. McCORMACK. The answer to that, I think, is yes. I do not think the suspensions will take long. As far as I know, after looking into them and examining them, I think they have all been reported out of committee unanimously. Some of them may be passed by unanimous consent. In the case of bills which involve over a million dollars, the objectors' committee feels such bills should come up under suspension or under the regular rules of the House. I think they are right as a general rule. While this is a long list of suspensions, I do not think their consideration will take long.

Mr. BARDEN. I wonder if the gentleman will go along with me in the statement that if we do not complete the school construction bill on Monday, then, there being no rollcall votes on Tuesday, and the Fourth of July coming on Wednesday, the first rollcall vote possible after Monday would be on Thursday.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. BURNSIDE].

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, during the debate on the armed services bill today, I got up and asked some of the Members why it was that Russia was able to produce more planes and probably better planes than we were. Well, the thing is, they did not want to answer that question and they were quite worried about it. One of the answers, I think, is that they are turning out 2½ times as many engineers as we are. I went to the National Science Foundation, to the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to the NEA, and to the gentleman who spent 1 year in Russia, making a special study on scientific development in Russia. They tell me that one of the major reasons is that the Russians are worshipping science and not God, and that they are making a terrific expansion in nuclear science.

Mr. Chairman, we are now considering H. R. 7535 to provide Federal aid to the States for construction of critically needed school facilities. Earlier this

year I polled educational leaders in my district to get their views on this question.

I mailed questionnaires to teachers, P. T. A. leaders, members of boards of education, and others directly connected with the field of education. I received 392 responses. Of these, 345 unqualifiedly endorsed Federal aid; 17 favored Federal aid with restrictions, and only 30 opposed Federal aid in toto. In view of the overwhelming approval of Federal aid in my district revealed by this questionnaire, I feel that I must, in good conscience, as a representative of the residents of my congressional district, go on record as an endorser of the Kelley bill. Beyond my obligation to the majority of my constituents however, I could not oppose the Kelley bill without ignoring my own convictions which have been strengthened and affirmed by research I have undertaken recently into this very urgent problem.

It is customary to preface all discussions of Federal aid to education with a reaffirmation of the principle that education is primarily a local responsibility. Proponents of Federal aid then normally point out their own determination not to avoid this tradition. Opponents are likely to argue that despite the honorable intentions of those who advocate Federal participation, there can be none without a measure of Federal control, which, however insignificant at first, must inevitably burgeon into total occupation of the educational system by the Federal Government, accompanied by the consequent elimination of the primary and preferred responsibility of the localities.

Mr. Chairman, I am of the opinion that while the debate on this basic question has certainly not been in vain, it has most definitely been overemphasized. That the education of our youth can most conveniently be supervised on the local level, is certainly not subject to debate. That local supervision results in a healthy interest in the school system benefiting both the community and the child is likewise axiomatic. But what is equally true in my estimation is that there is a clear national interest in education which, although it has existed since the founding of our Nation, has become increasingly critical only in recent years.

First of all, education is at the basis of our form of government, for democracy is prefaced upon the right of the individual to intelligently choose how he shall be governed. This choice, in turn, can only be made if the people are sufficiently educated so as to equip themselves with the knowledge and facts necessary to make it. Quite beyond this basic interest, however, the existence of an adequate school system is directly related to innumerable functions delegated by the Constitution to the Federal Government.

One of the most vital of these is the obligation imposed upon the Congress by the Constitution of protecting the United States against foreign enemies. To that end, we are empowered to maintain an Army and a Navy and to promote sufficient military strength to oppose the subjugation of this Nation by an alien

power. Since the drafting of the Constitution in Philadelphia over a century and a half ago, the measures called for by this requirement have radically changed. It was for a time sufficient to rely upon a minute defense establishment, far greater reliance for our safety being placed in our natural barriers, the seas, which surround us. Now those obstacles are, in effect, avenues of approach over and through which an aggressor could with ease bring his forces to our shores. It was sufficient for a time to rely for our safety upon the natural pacifism of our fellow nations and their peoples. Even when powerful and aggressive tyrants threatened us, we could rely upon our quick ability to spring to the defense, and meet, with equal military weapons, the challenge to our freedom. Today, however, we are engaged in a new and frightening kind of struggle. It is not war, nor is it peace in the traditional sense—it is not a simple arms race, though, of course, that is a part of the conflict. This unceasing duel, to which we are a party, is developing around the invention and improvement of technological methods. The most essential element of this contest is the production of scientists, engineers, and skilled technicians. Herein lies one of our greatest weapons in this unusual conflict. Our school system, of course, is basic in our efforts to recruit people in technical fields, and that is why, Mr. Chairman, education has become so urgent to the Nation in the last few years. Our modern defense system cannot exist unless our school system is adequate. It is obvious then that we, as a nation, must be concerned with the education of our children, even though it be equally obvious that the respective States of which we, as a nation, are composed, are themselves responsible in the first instance for the maintenance of a system for the instruction of their own citizens.

Throughout our history, the Federal Government has made contributions to the progress of education. Land grants, vocational education legislation, and, of course, veterans' benefits in that field, have been of tremendous assistance to the States; but none of these projects has effected a change in the principle of primary local responsibility. Likewise, I see nothing in the bill now before us exceeding the Federal interest or threatening local control of our educational system. In view of the peril which we face, and the importance of education in our efforts to meet the danger, we must, I firmly believe, take immediate action to help our States keep their schools up to date.

Mr. Chairman, the urgency for action is graphically revealed by a brief look at progress within the Soviet Union. We have only recently been awakened to the growth of the Soviet military effort—a development so dramatic and so far-reaching as to challenge, equal, or, as some have said, to surpass our own defensive strength. A prominent part of her accomplishments can undoubtedly be traced to the development within the U. S. S. R. of a vast educational system. Less than half a century ago, probably more than one-half of the Russian population was illiterate. To-

day, we find the Communist totalitarian government embarked upon a school program which will shortly approach an enrollment of 100 percent. Under the Russian 10-year school program, each child from 7 to 17 will ultimately be required to attend classes held 6 days a week, 10 months a year. Even today, these children are encouraged, cajoled, and forced into absorbing as much knowledge as their abilities will permit. There are vast numbers of 10-year schools in Russia now. Many more are being constructed.

In addition, there are more than 2,000 vocational colleges which give technical training to 2½ million students who take over key jobs in the Russian industrial effort. Some 800 colleges and universities in Russia have an estimated student population of nearly 2 million. One of these institutions, the University of Moscow, recently completed a 33-story science building containing 1,900 laboratory rooms. This one building cost the equivalent of \$150 million. This is more than has been spent on the entire plant of most American universities.

In addition, the Russian Government offers every conceivable incentive to education. According to former Senator William Benton, who visited Soviet Russia and who is an expert in this field, Soviet professors earn the equivalent of the annual salary of an American corporation president. They are granted great prestige and freedom. It is only natural, therefore, that Russia has increased the number of trained engineers from 41,000 in 1920 to 541,000 in 1954, or 1,300 percent.

In the same period, engineers in the United States increased only about 43 percent. Russia last year graduated some 63,000 engineers, 40,000 more than the United States. This same picture is true of scientists and other professions in the technological field. One of our greatest weaknesses is in inducing a sufficient number of high-school graduates to enroll in higher education and particularly in scientific fields.

Of all high-school graduates whose qualifications are such as to warrant their striving to become engineers and scientists, about one-half cease further schooling to go into the business of earning a living. Of the half who go on to college, only 40 percent graduate. Thus, of every 10 high-school graduates with capacities for careers in engineering and science, only 2 graduate from college. From that point on, the attrition is even greater, for of all college graduates less than 3 percent go on with their studies to earn a doctor of philosophy degree.

Secretary Folsom, of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, states the same facts in another way. He says that—

Each year about 60,000 students of high ability drop out of high school before graduation * * * and half of the students in the upper one-fourth of their high-school classes do not go on to college.

Dr. Dael Wolfe, administration secretary, American Association for the Advancement of Science, estimates that 150,000 high-school graduates who have the potential capacities to enter such important specialties as engineering and

science, fail each year to go on to college. This is a loss equal to one-fifth of all the freshmen who enrolled in America's colleges and universities last fall. Had they enrolled, the entering class would have been about 840,000, instead of the presently reported 690,000.

During the current college year, about 10.5 percent of the entire freshman enrollment in colleges and universities chose to specialize in engineering. They totaled 72,800 students. Had all the capable high-school graduates gone to college, and had they followed the present pattern of electing their courses, nearly 84,000 students would have been in engineering courses. And had they carried on to complete their courses, the graduating class in 1960 would be increased by about 20 percent, or some 8,000 more than the 41,000 now estimated for that year.

About half of the students who do not attend college might pursue further education with proper incentive. The lack of incentive is in large part due to the inadequate training in sciences in our high schools. Mr. Speaker, we know that many of our schools lack proper facilities for good science instruction. I shall not dwell upon the need for such facilities because I think it is obvious to anyone who has visited many American schools. This shortage, however, not only deprives the student of training in a field vital to the Nation; but it discourages education in every way. It handicaps teachers and places a burden upon school and college administrations. It is, however, a deficiency which we can correct or at least make progress toward correcting by enactment of the legislation before us today.

Turning again to Russia, let us look at the steps which are being taken there. In 1953, the last year for which statistics are available, the Russian budget included 62,089,527,000 rubles for education and culture. This was approximately 12 percent of the entire Russian budget. In the 1957 budget, we propose to spend for educational purposes a total of \$393,705,351, or one-half of 1 percent of our total budget. Using approximate dollar values, this means that the Soviet is spending at least some 20 times as much for education as we are spending. Such a contrast cannot long be continued if we are to continue to exist as a nation. Already, the Russian advances have revealed themselves in the production of planes, nuclear energy, and many other military resources. They will increase to a point far in excess of that which we can hope to attain in the future unless we begin to keep pace. One of the best ways to start is to enact into law H. R. 7535 which will give a much needed boost to our public schools and which will improve the chances of our children to equip themselves to exist in times which will call for the fullest utilization of the abilities of every American citizen.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 14 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, America has many domestic problems today. We are trying to solve some of them. This Congress is trying to solve some of

them. We just completed the passage of the largest highway construction bill in the history of the earth. The Congress is now in the midst of expanding and broadening the coverage of the Social Security Act. Effective on March 1 of this year, by law we raised the minimum wage. Shortly, we will receive a rivers and harbors bill and a flood-control authorization bill. There are many others. Mr. Chairman, having said this as a background, I want to say, in my humble judgment, there is no piece of legislation now before the Congress, or that has been before the Congress this year, that is of greater importance to the welfare and the well-being of America than is this bill providing Federal aid for school construction.

Mr. Chairman, I have had the privilege of serving on the various subcommittees that have worked on this matter since 1953. I served with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS] and his subcommittee that made its final report on December 2, 1954. At that time we said to the country that—

There is no question that more classrooms are urgently needed. This need has been repeatedly demonstrated by school surveys, by reports from State governors and by testimony during extensive . . . hearings.

I would like to say to the Members of the House that I believe we have had just about every school officer in every State in America before one or the other of our subcommittees since 1953. After hearing all of this testimony, which now comprises many hundred printed pages, we went a bit further and made this statement on December 2, 1954, to which I wholeheartedly subscribe:

Adequate education for our children is essential to the preservation of a free and strong Nation. Their education must not be impaired by serious classroom shortages which exist in every State in this Union.

My friends, I do not know from firsthand information, of course, what may be the case in any other State in America, but last year in the month of February, I called on the school superintendent of the county of Fayette, Ala., and a member, I believe the chairman of the county board of education. I said to those gentlemen, let us take the next 2 or 3 days and look at every single schoolhouse in this county. We did just that. Then I followed that up last fall by visiting an additional 60 schools in the Seventh Congressional District of Alabama. I know not except from what I have heard the witnesses testify what the situation may be in any other State in America, but insofar as what I found to exist in my own congressional district, what I have seen with my own eyes, there is a great and immediate, and I might say, a critical need for school construction and for the legislation which we have before this House this afternoon.

I would like to say at this point, and I want to say it because I believe it very sincerely, that I think we tried in this bill more than any other committee in Congress has ever done in any other bill to eliminate those elements of Federal control that we all fear and that we do not want in this bill. My friend and colleague from Arizona [Mr. RHODES],

dealt at great length with that subject this afternoon. I will not repeat what he said, except to say this, that this bill contains less Federal control, if indeed there is any in it, it contains less Federal control than any education bill we have ever passed in the United States Congress, and that includes Public Law 815 and Public Law 874. It includes the original law that we passed in 1917 on vocational education, and it includes the most recent amendments of that act, Public Law 565 of the 83d Congress, which became the law on August 3, 1954.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I am glad the gentleman made that point. Is it not true that practically every law that we passed dealing with education has contained State plans? In other words, the State had to decide how the money would be administered and how it would be operated. There is nothing new about a State plan?

Mr. ELLIOTT. The State plan is at least 39 years of age. The State plan is something that this Congress is familiar with. This bill has less State plan about it than does any of the others, insofar as I have been able to ascertain.

Now, this ought to be said: When we had about finished this bill I offered what is commonly known in our committee as the Elliott amendment. It is the last section of this bill, section 405. I want to read it, because I think it is important. I think it cures any other defect in this field of Federal control that you might find in this bill.

Section 405 reads as follows:

In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

Now, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that in my humble judgment this bill does not have in it the Federal control that some people who have spoken on it this afternoon appear to find; of course, I accord to them the right to view the matter in any manner they may see fit.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM].

Mr. LANDRUM. In relation to section 409 of the bill which the gentleman has just read, I wonder if he would favor an amendment to that section making it read something like this:

That in the administration of this act no Federal officer, employee, or agency shall have any supervision, direction, or control over: (1) the personnel, curriculum, or program of the institution; (2) the establishment of standards for admission to public schools for any district; or (3) the defining of the area to be served by the school.

Would the gentleman object to the amendment spelling out exactly what is meant by control?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I think that section 405, as I have just read it, does everything the gentleman wishes except that it does not

go into the detail that he has spelled out. I say further to the gentleman, that if he offers his amendment it will be my intention to vote for it.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the membership of this House that I think it would be particularly ill-timed and ill-advised for us to pass the so-called Powell amendment.

We have an unusual problem in the Southland with which many of the Members of this House are familiar; and I say to the membership of this House: Please do not push too far in this direction. All sections of the Deep South have complete school segregation at the present time, and if you pass this so-called Powell amendment, I say to you, Mr. Chairman, the result is going to be that the school children of America, white school children and colored school children in every section are going to suffer. The Powell amendment which seeks to prevent the expenditure of Federal school construction funds in segregated areas, can do no good. It will do great harm.

Let us go forward, Mr. Chairman, to pass this bill and get this school construction program under way and in the next 3 or 4 years get sufficient classrooms that all of our children of whatever race or color will have adequate schools to attend. I sincerely hope that the Members of this House will defeat the Powell amendment and pass this bill.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman believe it will make any great difference whether the Powell amendment were adopted or not insofar as the public schools in his State receiving funds authorized here?

Mr. ELLIOTT. I certainly do, I may say to the gentleman from Mississippi. I have done some research in this field. I may be wrong, no one can be positive about this, but I do not believe it is the intention of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to withhold these funds from any State unless the Department is forced to do so by the Powell amendment, or unless it is directed to do so by court order. As I read the decision of the Supreme Court I do not believe it is the spirit of the decision to press this matter at this time with the speed the gentleman thinks it will be pressed. As I say, maybe the gentleman is right and maybe I am wrong; I do not know, but the gentleman asked me for my opinion.

Mr. COLMER. I did, and I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me and I appreciate his frank statement, but I think the gentleman is doing a little hopeful thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COLMER. I think the gentleman is doing a little wishful thinking. I call his attention to the fact that I pointed out here yesterday on the floor and put

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a statement of the AFL-CIO executive committee, whatever that is, that they are going to watch the administration of this act and that they are going to see there are no funds going to the segregated schools.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I may say to the gentleman that I have not had a chance to read his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and have not seen the statement he refers to, but I do not know that the people to whom he refers will have a great deal to do with the distribution of the funds any more than the gentleman from Mississippi will have or that the gentleman now speaking will have.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman recognizes they have funds and plenty of lawyers, just as the NAACP. I think the gentleman is doing a little wishful thinking.

Mr. ELLIOTT. I will say to the gentleman that I hope no group agitates the very delicate situation under which we are operating in the South at the present time. If suits are brought I trust that the courts will handle them with due consideration, and will rule justly and with equity. Our defeat of the Powell amendment here will be a warning to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it is not the intention of the Congress of the United States that the Department withhold funds from our schools, either under this bill, or under Public Laws 815 and 874, or under the laws pertaining to rehabilitation, or under the laws pertaining to vocational education. I regret with the gentleman that the Supreme Court has ruled segregation in the public schools to be illegal. I regret that there are those who continue to agitate the matter. The gentleman knows, and I know that the South will exhaust every legal means to preserve segregation. I believe there will be segregation in the schools of the South for a long, long time.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE].

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in these few moments in opposition to this legislation. I would not be misunderstood and have you believe that I am of the opinion, however, that we do not need additional school buildings in this country or additional facilities or better facilities. I admit that. I do not think that is the issue here today and it has not been the issue since the beginning of the study on this all-important problem.

We all recognize the fact that in many areas of this land there are not sufficient buildings, there are not sufficient schools, and in many cases facilities and teachers. In some cases the teachers are underpaid. But, whose duty is it to supply these things? That is the issue. That is the fact that is facing us.

Are we going to set aside the orderly processes of carrying on our educational program in this country since the beginning of the country? Are we going to take that duty and that responsibility out of the hands of the local authorities, out of the hands of the people back in the States? I could talk for a long time on States rights. All of us know that much has been said on that question.

Much has been said to the effect that some of our States rights have been taken from us, that many steps have been taken in the direction of placing a little more control in the hands of the Federal Government. That is true. Some gentleman yesterday held up a volume that looked almost like a Sears, Roebuck catalog and said:

These many laws, these many statutes have already been enacted in this country depriving States and the local authorities of certain rights, privileges or powers in connection with the operation of their schools.

They use that as an argument to show it is not dangerous to take a few more rights, privileges, authority and responsibilities from the people.

But I say, look at it on the other hand. The very fact that many statutes, that many regulations, that many steps have been taken that would deprive the States and the local authorities of these rights is evidence we are going to the ultimate end that I tell you we are headed for. You do not do these things, Mr. Chairman, all in one step. You do it by a bite at a time, step by step, one act after another. This one that we are going to take now if we pass this legislation is the biggest, the longest step of all of them and it is the one that will lead to the ultimate end, which means that the control of your schools will before many years go into the hands of Federal authorities. There is no doubt in my mind about that. Of course, that is an opinion, just like those on the other side who have an opposite opinion. But, my friends, you can look at history and you will see that Federal authority follows Federal money, and you give it time enough and it will get there in this case. Federal control follows Federal cold cash dollars. So you do not have to write it into this legislation in order for that to be true. You do not have to have the Powell amendment, as several have already argued here. No. The President of the United States, as a reasonable inference under the decisions of the United States Supreme Court within the last 2 years, or the Commissioner of Federal Education, in my opinion, could issue a Federal order that would say not 1 dollar of this money shall be spent in any school unless that school goes down the line for integration. I do not think there is any question about that, and many good lawyers here have told you that, one a former judge of the supreme court of the State of Montana. I am willing to stand on that gentleman's opinion on that matter.

So let us keep these things that are closest to our people, these things that are dearest, our own schools, in the hands of the people, and let us not, by giving this Federal money, invite Washington and a strong Central Government to come in and take over. Now, I am not the only one of that opinion. There are other Members of the House who have spoken here today who are of that opinion. But also, there are many others who think likewise. Just recently I am sure some of you read an editorial in the Saturday Evening Post. That editorial showed a great deal of background and analysis and thought and study, and it

pointed out, among other things, that the shortage of school buildings in this country today, the shortage of facilities or lack of facilities, was not in the ghost towns or in the depressed areas of this country. It is not there, but on the contrary, the shortage is in the big, wealthy areas where they have people with money and property that they can levy taxes on to remedy their own situation.

Gentlemen, I happen to be from South Carolina, and I would like to tell you what we have done there in the short time I have remaining. When Jim Byrnes was elected governor in 1950 and took office in 1951, South Carolina, the smallest of the Southern States, one of the poorest in the Nation, immediately enacted under this leadership a 3 percent sales tax. That money was earmarked to be used for school buildings and for school purposes and for no other. Now, no one can tell me that every State in this Union cannot take care of its own needs and facilities so far as schools go. I am citing what we did in my little, poor State of South Carolina. In those 4 years while he was governor, 1951, 1952, 1953, 1954, the State of South Carolina spent \$100 million for school buildings and many more millions for facilities and to increase the pay of teachers. So, if we can do it, you can do it. All that you and your people, your governors, and your State legislators have to do is have the courage, enthusiasm, and love to go forth and do what they ought to do, and not call on the Federal Government to hand out more Federal funds.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am particularly happy to follow the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] because I think the point that I shall attempt to make complements and supplements precisely the point the gentleman has made.

Mr. Chairman, we in the Congress are on clear notice, from certain determined and powerful organizations and leadership in this country, as to their long-term purpose and intent in supporting the legislation before this committee.

For me that purpose and intent is the most compelling reason, among many reasons, for my opposition to this or any similar legislation.

Because I believe we are all entitled to a knowledge and understanding of this purpose and intent, I propose to document a few of the representative declarations on this score.

And because I wish to present these facts as an uninterrupted narrative, I hope I will not be asked to yield during my presentation.

On July 6 of last year the Honorable Adlai Stevenson addressed the annual convention of the National Education Association on the subject of America's No. 1 Must. In this address he said:

To meet this appalling situation (of schoolroom shortage) we must start—

And I stress the word "start"—

We must start with passage of the proposals now before Congress for \$400 million of Federal funds each year for the next 4 years for school construction to be matched by State funds.

And, Mr. Stevenson went on to say:

Careful calculations indicate that a Federal grant to the States of approximately \$50 million a year for teacher education, if matched by an equal amount of new State funds, will at least break the back of this problem.

That is not all. Mr. Stevenson goes on to say further:

So much for the present. Over the longer run—

Mr. Stevenson does not say how much longer—

Over the longer run it may be best, it seems to me, not to tie Federal assistance to specific purposes, such as school construction, but rather to make unrestricted cash grants to the States on a per pupil basis. State governments would then have much greater flexibility to distribute these funds among local school districts for whatever purpose would most effectively advance education.

There is still another proposal in Mr. Stevenson's program:

Finally, I would suggest a modest program of national scholarships to promising candidates who upon graduation would undertake to give some years to teaching.

Then comes the payoff sentence in Mr. Stevenson's address to the NEA—and I respect his candor and hope it will be matched on this floor during this debate:

Yet there should be no evading the fact that the composite program I am suggesting here will be expensive, and it is just a beginning.

There you have it—"just a beginning."

That is what I am talking about today. There is the clear warning signal from one who knows whereof he speaks, and has no hesitancy in proclaiming the goal he has in view.

Unfortunately, the candor of Mr. Stevenson's statement is not always matched by the National Education Association, whose convention he was addressing. Presumably other Members of this House have received in recent months the NEA brochure entitled "Now Is the Time—Act Today To Build Tomorrow's Schools."

This brochure prominently quotes the statement of a witness before a committee of the other body who purported to speak for the National Congress of Parents and Teachers. This witness said:

This has become a national emergency, and emergencies need special consideration. We believe that such legislation to aid this situation should be on a terminal emergency basis.

The witness, of course, was speaking of the classroom shortage. By quoting this statement, the NEA brochure clearly gives the impression that it favors Federal assistance only on "a terminal emergency basis." Such an impression is totally false. The NEA is officially on record in its 1955 platform as advocating—without any reference to a terminal emergency basis—"financial assistance from the Federal Government to the States for the support of public education."

If there is any remaining question as to the goal of the National Education Association—the goal of permanent, all-

out, all-type Federal aid to education—the doubts must be completely dispelled by the testimony before a committee of the other body last year by Dr. William G. Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association:

As long as our schools are cut off from the most powerful and efficient and productive form of taxation that we have (Federal taxation, of course), so long will they fail to receive a reasonable share of the great wealth and income of our country.

Can you, my colleagues, by the most generous interpretation of this statement, by the remotest stretch of the imagination, read into this statement of Dr. Carr, an intention to seek and secure Federal assistance to the States for school construction on merely a terminal emergency basis?

Can you interpret this as conforming, in the slightest degree, to the declared intention of President Eisenhower that "once"—the classroom—"shortage is overcome, the Federal-grant program can and must terminate"?

You know the answer.

You know that Adlai Stevenson spoke the truth—"it is just the beginning."

I am not, for a moment, questioning the honesty or the sincerity of those—including many of my colleagues—who earnestly protest that Federal assistance to the States for school construction is a one-time, emergency, terminal program.

But I do question their realism. I question their understanding of the resolute and unyielding purpose of many who welcome—and have long sought—this measure as an opening wedge, as a camel's nose in the tent. I question their awareness of the pressures built up behind the floodgates they propose to open only temporarily.

Bear with me as I cite further testimony as to what these relentless and ruthless pressure groups admittedly have in mind.

I invite you to note this statement, in the February 1956 NEA Journal, by Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration at Teachers College, Columbia University:

Even if \$500 million (a year) were voted for school-building aid, it would represent only a first step toward adequate Federal participation in the financial support of education in the United States.

Note also this testimony before a congressional committee last year by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers:

We recommend * * * that Federal assistance for school facilities be at least one-third the amount of Federal assistance for highways during the next decade, in order that competition for State (matching) funds may be equitable.

These statements are moderate indeed compared with the next one I shall offer. Listen to this, written in the October 1955 NEA Journal by Finis E. Engleman, State commissioner of education of Connecticut:

Since for many years funds (that is, from Federal sources) will only be sufficient to supplement the State and local efforts, some safeguards must be erected to insure the continuance of local and State effort to finance their schools.

Can anyone deny that the import of these words is that some day funds from Federal sources will do all—or at least the bulk—of the job? Perhaps Mr. Stevenson spoke even more truly than he knew when he said, "It is just a beginning." I want no part of such a beginning.

In my own State of Michigan, as both you and Mr. Stevenson have reason to know, we have a governor who openly avows his opposition to moderation. That applies to this matter of Federal aid to education as well. He has no patience with a program of \$400 million a year for 4 years—a paltry total of \$1,600,000,000. He is on record as advocating a 5-year program of \$16 billion plus—including \$3½ billion for college and university construction and adult education, fertile fields for still further ventures in Federal aid.

Let us make no mistake about it. This small string of "terminal emergency assistance" we hold in our hand, if we elect here to pull it, will release upon us and upon succeeding Congresses, an avalanche of demands which will surely smother all capacity for resistance—and with it all that we have heretofore known as the American principle of State and local responsibility for education, the very foundation of freedom and Federal Government of limited powers.

Permit me to bring it home to you in even more specific terms as to what we are beginning—in political terms if you please.

The NEA brochure I mentioned earlier, issued to the teachers of the Nation, carries this instruction:

In addition to personal visits and communications with your Congressman, seek the support of political party leaders, including precinct, county, congressional district, and State chairmen. Remember that 1956 is an election year in which each member of the House of Representatives runs for office.

How could coming events cast a clearer shadow before?

And some of us thought we had a difficult problem these past few days in dealing with the subject of veterans' pensions!

This proposed legislation is "just a beginning" not alone in terms of financial demands or perpetual lobbying pressures.

It is also "just a beginning" for the insidious and fatal doctrine that there is really nothing to fear in terms of Federal power and control in the field of education.

Already we are hearing the siren words of reassurance—words that ought to ring like an alarm bell in our conscience and consciousness. Governor Averell Harriman, speaking to his State's White House Conference on Education in support of Federal assistance for school construction said:

For members of the Administration to oppose Federal aid because of the supposed danger of Federal control, as some have done, is to assert in effect, that they do not have the ability to write the simplest of statutory paragraphs. It is to assert, further, that they do not have the capacity to restrain themselves when they administer the law.

I refuse to believe such confessions of ineptitude—even from Republicans.

I prefer to accept the far more realistic warnings of another Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, who spoke so eloquently of the dangers of "confidence in men," and who insisted that they ought to be "bound by the chains of the Constitution."

I recall the statement of another individual, Dr. Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times, who also apparently does not share the concern voiced by Jefferson. Some years ago Dr. Fine told a congressional committee, with what seems to me an excess of flattery:

I don't know why so many of us are afraid of our Government when all of the people back home are the ones that send you here, and if they continue to send such intelligent representatives in the future as they have in the past, I don't think we need to be concerned that you or the Government will take over the prerogatives of our own citizens.

I am not sure Thomas Jefferson would share that confidence in the Government. I know I do not.

There is written into this bill, H. R. 7535, a purported guarantee against the encroachment of Federal control over education. Section 450 provides that—

In the administration of this act, no department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the personnel, curriculum, or program of instruction of any school or school system.

I think the most appropriate comment to be made on that provision was made by the President of Columbia University in 1949 when he spoke of "fancied safeguards" proposed by those "who urge greater and greater centralization of authority and greater and greater dependence upon the Federal Treasury." That Columbia University president, Dwight D. Eisenhower, said:

My own conviction is that the very fact that they feel the need to surround their proposal with legal safeguards is in itself a cogent argument for the defeat of the proposal.

No statutory provision in the world can provide adequate safeguard against Federal control of education once Federal financing support of education is an accepted principle.

The then United States Commissioner of Education, Samuel M. Brownell, in a minority report of the Education Study Committee of the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, said that Federal "grants should be given in such a way as to encourage effective organization and administration of schools; they should not tend to perpetuate inefficient structural school organization within the States." Is not that Federal control of education?

Or listen to this statement in an article in the NEA Journal of December 1955 by Roy E. Larsen and Henry Toy, Jr., chairman and director, respectively, of the National Citizens Commission for the Public Schools. This article, incidentally, was not written on the subject of Federal assistance to the States for school construction—it was written on

Forces Affecting the Curriculum, for consumption within the professional educational circles—hence its extreme frankness:

Over the years * * * a number of administrative and leadership functions have devolved upon the (U. S.) Office (of Education) which have made it a vital force in the area of curriculum. The Smith-Hughes and later vocational education acts give the Office of Education considerable administrative authority over vocational programs at both the State and community level.

The publications of the Office of Education have exercised a potent influence over the thinking and action in our classrooms. And the agency's leadership in sponsoring curriculum research and experimentation (as in the case of life-adjustment education) is widely known.

Is not that Federal control of education?

What conceivable statutory safeguard can assure that this terminal emergency program of assistance to the States for school construction will not be just a beginning of more and more Federal influence and control in education?

To ask the question, it seems to me, is to answer it.

In one final respect—to me the most serious of all—this is literally "just a beginning."

I refer to the shameful practice of advocates of all-out permanent Federal aid deprecating and minimizing the accomplishments of States and local units in meeting their own educational problems.

Dr. Carr, of the NEA, whose compelling urge to gain access to the most powerful and efficient and productive form of taxation I have already cited, exemplifies this attitude. In his testimony before the same congressional committee, Dr. Carr asserted that failure to recognize the economic necessity of access to Federal tax support is "the real obstacle beside which all the petty details of tinkering with some local tax rate or some State statute about debt limitations are as molehills to mountains."

Never have I seen concentrated in a single sentence such an ungracious, ungrateful, unwarranted, and brutal expression of contempt for State and local support which over the years has made the American public-school system the greatest and the freest in the world.

It is a wanton and unpardonable slap in the face for a host of public officials and private citizens at State and local levels who have worked, and are working today, unremittingly and with growing success, to cope with the problem of adequate financial support for the schools.

Compare this statement with the fact that in 1955 aggregate State and local support of the schools totaled \$10.9 billion—an increase of \$1½ billion over the previous year. Incidentally this \$1½ billion increase is nearly 4 times the amount of annual Federal aid for school construction proposed in the Kelley bill.

Compare this statement of Dr. Carr with the comment of Governor Stratton, of Illinois:

We don't need Federal aid for schools (in Illinois). * * * Whatever Federal aid we could get would be only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are doing ourselves.

Compare this slurring comment of Dr. Carr with the fact that in my own congressional district, in the city of Kalamazoo, Mich., the voters of the school district within the past month approved financing of a \$14-million school-building program. This is only \$3 million less than the Kelley bill would provide for distribution in the entire State of Michigan for an entire year. Incidentally, Michigan will pay \$2 for every \$1 it will receive under this program. Also, incidentally, this statute will vest in one official of the State of Michigan authority to determine the criteria, the priorities, and the allocations on which these funds will be distributed within the State. And, furthermore, Kalamazoo, I am sure, will not be eligible for any aid—the penalty of having met its own problems; the penalty, in Dr. Carr's words, of "tinkering with some local tax rate."

I want you to know, my colleagues, of some of the thinking, of some of the purposes, of some of the declarations of intent emanating from powerful sources in this Nation. I want you to know of the firm and ruthless determination that this will in truth be "just a beginning."

And what will the end be, if we set our foot upon this path?

I offer only the prophecy of one expert in the field of Federal-State relations, Leonard D. White of the University of Chicago. And it is a dire and tragic warning, particularly with respect to its implications for free public education in these United States. Says Dr. White:

If present trends continue for another quarter century, the States may be left hollow shells, operating primarily as the field districts of Federal departments and dependent upon the Federal treasury for their support.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The Chairman. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, regardless of the effect on our individual State allotments, we all should support an amendment to this legislation in order that, first, Federal funds will be allocated for school construction on the basis of need; and, second, that those States which are taxing themselves to the hilt to meet their own school-building crisis be given special encouragement.

The bill as reported from committee fails in these particulars.

We all recognize that there is a serious schoolbuilding shortage in the Nation today. This legislation will not solve that shortage. An annual grant of \$400 million is a lot of money, but it is only a drop in the bucket as far as the amount of money States and local school districts are now spending for new schools.

Unless we want to go further in debt—or increase Federal taxes—this Federal school-construction aid can never, except in a very small way, solve our schoolbuilding shortage. We must continue to depend upon the resources of our States and local school districts to meet their own building needs.

What then is the excuse for any Federal aid at all? To my mind, the best argument for this legislation is that it is designed to stimulate and encourage our States and local government subdivisions to meet their own problems. By offering to return some of the Federal taxes levied from local residents, this measure hopes to spur State and local governmental units to make even greater efforts locally to finance and build new school structures.

The so-called Kelley bill is inferior to the measure supported by President Eisenhower in this regard. By distributing Federal funds on a straight per-capita basis—to rich and poor districts alike—the Kelley bill will promote even greater inequities in school facilities than now exist. A rich State, which can meet its own building needs, will use this extra money either to put icing on their school building cakes or to reduce an already moderate school-tax levy.

A poor State or district, however, already bonded to the hilt, paying heavy levies for school debt service, taxing to the limit to meet operating expenses, may be hard-pressed meeting the matching requirements of the Kelley bill.

For that reason, I support the President's program. Federal aid for school construction should be more than just another program of returning to the taxpayers dollars the Federal Government takes from them and brings to Washington. The program should be so designed to lead the States and localities toward a solution of their own problem. I hope the House will support the amendment to use the President's formula for distributing Federal-aid funds.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS].

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, I regard this as an historic debate, and I have listened with great interest to the comments that have come from men who have a dedicated concern about this problem. I speak to you, myself, out of a wealth of educational experience. I was the 1916 summer session teacher at Sunny Point Schoolhouse, District No. 7, Illinois township, Pope County, Ark. I had reached the mature age of 17. I had only 81 pupils enrolled so you know that I imparted a lot of information that summer and acquired a lot myself. It was a little one-room schoolhouse, and I could not find room to seat them all. But, I can say to you today, on the basis of that experience, and contemplating the conditions that have been presented to us today, that this Nation cannot long endure half-seated and half-sheltered.

I must confess that I am a bit envious of the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor. Its members have produced a great piece of legislation and have participated in a dramatic forward step in rounding out a Federal policy on education. I am glad to give this measure my enthusiastic support. While I have reservations as to some of its provisions, particularly those which appear to bypass the States in the extension of credit to districts, I am convinced that its formula for a grant-in-aid is basically correct and that it meets

our responsibilities in the present emergency.

We cannot be sure, of course, how the bill will look when amendments have been acted upon, and naturally I will reserve judgment on some of these very difficult questions that have been presented. But, I fear that in a discussion of some of the technical points, we may lose sight of the crucial policy decision being made, and might fail to do a constructive job in what is, perhaps, the No. 1 problem in the United States. Some of my colleagues have spoken as if we were entering a new field. I do not agree that this is the case. As early as 1787, the first year in which we operated under a Federal Constitution, there were Federal grants to education. So, it is not a new program.

This is not the first study that has been made of Federal and State functions in public education. Recently, for example, the Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the Kestnbaum Commission, of which I had the privilege of serving along with my friends, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OSTERAG], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER], attempted to approach this problem with an objective attitude. There was little emotion in the discussion we gave to the problem over a period of months. I would like the RECORD to show that the Kestnbaum Commission recommended that where there is a proven need for school building construction, Federal assistance be extended to the States. I am not prepared to say today on the basis of personal knowledge that the need exists in every State. I know it exists in the State of Arkansas. But, the committee finds it exists everywhere. To me, one of the most interesting phases of this debate is that two of the leading proponents from opposite sides of the aisle, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] come from a State which would contribute more to this program than they would receive from it. Obviously, we will not do a good job from the national standpoint if we base our decisions solely on the effect on our individual States.

This bill meets established standards for grants-in-aid. It is a States rights bill, it provides for a specialized program only, and it is definitely limited as to time and the amount that may be expended. There is a wholesome interest throughout the country in redefining more precisely the functions of government. The Kestnbaum report contains interesting historical data on Federal assistance for education. The Commission pointed out that the concept of primary responsibility by the States and localities for elementary education is basic in our Government. That principle is unimpaired by this bill. The Commission found, however, that the Federal Government has long been interested in public education. The Land Grant Program of 1862, advanced by Mr. Lincoln, projected a Federal interest into school problems. In succeeding legislation, notably the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917, the vocational education programs in which the distinguished chairman of

the House Committee, Mr. BARDEN, has been so influential, and more recently Public Laws 815 and 874, all evidence a deep concern on the part of the Federal Government for the effectiveness of our school system.

Those who designed the patterns of our Government recognized the relationship of education to free institutions. James Madison put it like this: "A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy, or perhaps both," and as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] reminded us, George Washington in his Farewell Message asked the citizens of the young Republic to "promote those institutions that make for diffusion of knowledge."

If in the simple society of the nineteenth century leaders in the Federal Government recognized a relationship to the problems of education, certainly we of the twentieth century, constantly made conscious of the interdependence of communities and States, should be equally responsive to it.

Some of my friends from the same area I am honored to represent say that the States are able to meet this problem. Assuming that they could, this policy would impose great hardship upon many States and would disregard the principle of equalizing tax burdens.

Consider the contrast between the poorest area and the wealthiest area within the Nation. In 1950 areas of the 9 most favored States had 22 percent of the Nation's children and 30 percent of the Nation's income. The less favored area had 8.6 of the children and 1.6 of the income. In other words, in that favored area there was 19 times the income, and 2½ times the children. So the favored area gets an advantage of 7½ times per child over the least favored region.

The language read to you by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT] was as clear as it could be on the question of limiting Federal authority over the schools. As I tried to indicate, it is a specialized program. It does not deal with general aid. It does not even touch the problem of curriculum and personnel. It does not deal with ideological questions. When you provide brick and mortar to build schoolhouses for children, you escape many of the problems that defy solution.

The gentleman from California [Mr. JOHNSON], put his hand on one important phase of the legislation yesterday, and again today. I refer to the mobility of people. California has a severe problem, but the States which supplied her new population were left with problems too. Mobility of wealth is another element to consider not only in the Nation as a whole but within each of the States. There are islands of distress in the wealthiest State. Moreover the favored States will benefit from the building up of schools in the less economically favored States.

One of the best speeches I ever heard in support of Federal legislation in this

field was at a Kiwanis meeting in Pennsylvania. The speaker said:

Pennsylvania will contribute more than it will receive, but people who come from the less economically favored States to live and work among us will as a result be better prepared for our industrial life and will be greater assets to us. It would be money well spent for us Pennsylvanians.

At one stage of the discussions pertaining to aid for schools, Mr. Chairman, the theory was advanced that only the extremely low-income States should be the recipients of Federal aid. If the equalization principle could be applied with perfect precision that might be true, but I am glad that in this building program it was found advisable to include every State, for the emergency is nationwide.

According to the United States Office of Education figures, in 1952 we had 1 million classrooms, needing 312,000 additional classrooms to house our 8,881,000 children. Nearly one-third of the children enrolled in 1952-53 were affected by the classroom deficit. At the beginning of 1954 there was still a classroom deficit of more than 300,000. Increased enrollments require 50,000 new classrooms annually, with obsolescence requiring 8,000 additional classrooms. We are building 50,000 to 60,000 classrooms annually, meeting growth needs but not reducing the deficit. The cost of 300,000 classrooms is \$10 to \$12 billion, so we can see the importance of Federal assistance to eliminate the shortage. This bill would provide Arkansas with \$22,907,488 over a 4-year period, a significant contribution to overcoming the classroom shortage in my State, but obviously leaving the major responsibility to the State and local government educational agencies. Thus the theory on which this legislation rests is unassailable.

The Kestnbaum Commission classified the historic grants-in-aid programs as those, first to support State-administered activities that carry a primary Federal obligation; second, to stimulate activities that should remain State functions but carry certain national aspects; and third, to equalize throughout the Nation the opportunities and advantages that should be governmentally sustained. It is fair to say, I believe, that this legislation is impressed to some degree with all three of these motivations.

The declaration of the Kestnbaum Commission to which I alluded in support of school-building construction rested upon a compromise. It reads as follows:

The Commission recommends that responsibility for providing general public education continue to rest squarely upon the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission further recommends that the States act vigorously and promptly to discharge this responsibility. The Commission does not recommend a general program of Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary education, believing that the States have the capacity to meet their educational requirements. However, where, upon a clear factual finding of need and lack of resources, it is demonstrated that one or more States do not have sufficient tax resources to support an adequate school system, the National Government, through some appropriate means, would be justified

in assisting such States temporarily in financing the construction of school facilities—exercising particular caution to avoid interference by the National Government in educational processes or programs.

Mr. Chairman, the need is great and the proposed remedy will go far toward meeting it. For that reason I favor this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KEARNS].

Mr. KEARNS. Mr. Chairman, I have greatly enjoyed this debate, pro and con. It has been highly worth the time that anyone would want to invest in it.

Then, too, I want to praise the ranking minority member of our committee, [Mr. McCONNELL], for having the foresight when he was chairman of the full committee in the 83d Congress to appoint a subcommittee, which I had the pleasure of heading, to hold hearings in order to try to cope with the problem of classroom shortages. It was a problem then; it is a problem now.

We sent telegrams to all the Governors, asking them to state their needs either personally or through their chief school officers. I could not help but think when the gentleman from South Carolina was speaking that of all the messages we sent out the only refusal we had was a telegram from then Governor Byrnes. He said they did not need any Federal money, that they could take care of their own school system. So when the gentleman was speaking to you just now, he was telling you the truth.

I would share those opinions with him and Governor Byrnes. If it were possible for us to keep the tax dollars at home because then we would not be in the dilemma we are down here trying to find enough depleted dollars to go around. But notwithstanding this fact, we do bring the tax dollars to Washington, and we have money for everything else—highways, airports, and so forth—but when it comes to helping the school-child then we are immediately accused of being on the threshold of Federal control of education.

I am 100 percent opposed to Federal control of education; I want no part of it and believe in no phase of it, and when the day ever comes that this Federal Government gets into the practice of buying textbooks and paying teachers' salaries, then we will be on dangerous ground.

But in this Kelley bill, particularly Title I in which I am interested and claim some pride of authorship, we have a straight grant-in-aid program; it is a brick-and-mortar approach, as has been said here, to try to put classrooms in all the States where they are needed so that the boys and girls of America will have a suitable place to attend school.

Now let us look at one phase. I think in Pennsylvania, using the Keystone State again, we had for a number of years, some 27 years at least, one superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Haas, one of the grand men of education. He has retired now, but many of

your States have men heading your educational systems who are on a par with him.

The money that a State will receive under title I of the Kelley bill will be in the hands of such individuals for distribution in their States, not in the hands of any Member of this Congress, not in the hands of the legislatures of the States, but in the hands of the chief school officers, whether they have been appointed or elected. They are the ones who will have to point out the needy districts in their States, and that is where these classrooms will be placed. I do not know that I can recall any place in my district that would qualify for any of these classrooms; I think in my particular district we can take care of ourselves very well, but there are a lot of districts in Pennsylvania, as well as other States, that can well use the money to build much-needed classrooms. That, I think, is most excellent Federal assistance.

Title II and title III of the bill provide that if a school district does not qualify under the definition of needy, and is already bonded to its limit, yet additional classrooms are required, that district can still be taken care of.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEARNS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. Getting back to title I concerning plans, as I understand, under title I it will be those needy areas in Pennsylvania, as the plan provides, that will get those classrooms. Is that correct?

Mr. KEARNS. That is correct, and the same will be true of Kentucky. But the person who would determine that would be your own State educational officer and he would have the entire use of the money with which to do that very thing.

Getting back to Titles II and III, they have very fine possibilities. I know of a school that was just completed two months ago up in my area. They built it and they occupy it, yet they are now 18 classrooms short. Just think, 10 years ago we had less than 2 million babies being born in this country a year. In 1956 we will have had 4 million babies born. Then every six months, from the time that a child becomes of school age, he goes up and knocks on the door and wants to be admitted into a classroom, but possibly there is no classroom available for him to attend.

So when we begin reading this bill for amendment next week, I sincerely hope that we will stay with the Kelley bill and titles I, II, and III. However, I want to say that if we cannot be successful in the structure of the bill as it is now before us, the issue is vital enough that the amendments to be introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCONNELL] would be highly acceptable.

As we have the weekend to think this over, all of us should be very, very cognizant of the fact that in considering this legislation we are considering the boys and girls of America, we are considering the greatest collateral we have in this country, the adult statesmen, lawyers,

and physicians of tomorrow. I hope each and every one of us will take time out to sit down in meditation over the weekend and decide to pass, for the first time, a bill to do something farsighted for the boys and girls of this country.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Chairman, the anchor man on the committee and the junior member comes on the scene when all the good arguments have been made. There is very little left to say except perhaps to indulge in a few generalizations. This to me has been a very educational day listening to Members of the House discuss this very vital national problem. I think we can draw some conclusions, too.

A year and a half ago when I first came to the Congress, there was in our committee a rather lively dispute at that time whether there really was a classroom shortage in the country. Apparently we have settled that question once and for all and that no longer is really the basic issue. Practically all of us are agreed that there is a very serious shortage. The only really serious argument that I heard made today in opposition to this legislation was the argument made very effectively, and I respect it, made by the gentleman from South Carolina when he said the States can handle this matter, leave them alone and let them handle it. He stated, and perhaps it is true, that in his own State, and there are a few others in a similar situation, they have done a remarkable job in recent years in building classrooms. But we are here in the National Legislature and we must consider the needs of the Nation as a whole. I think the one fact that governed our thinking in the committee was the national picture. That picture is one of a classroom shortage of 250,000 units or 300,000, something in that neighborhood.

What is the picture as far as eliminating that backlog and that shortage is concerned?

I think the latest statistics that I have seen show that we need annually, to take care of the increased enrollment, about 50,000 classrooms; due to obsolescence and replacement, another additional need of 8,000 to 10,000 classrooms; that the annual rate of construction today is somewhere in the neighborhood of 60,000 or perhaps a little over. In other words, we are not eliminating that great classroom shortage that we have carried as a legacy of the depression and of the war years. Therefore, that is the reason that we cannot accept that argument on a national basis. Perhaps we do not have the right leadership in the States at the State level, but in any event, we are not eating into that backlog and we are not getting our children properly housed.

There is another argument that has occurred from time to time in our discussion here, and to me it is not an argument that I think any of us should take seriously. It is the argument of Federal control. I think it has been pretty well demolished already, and I had hoped with one little push perhaps I could put

it in its grave and we could give it a decent burial at this time. I happened to have served, shortly before I came here to Congress, on a school board, and I think I know a little bit about the functions and the control of a school board, because it is the school board and the people who elect the people on the school board who exercise control over school matters. Therefore, this business of Federal control is not something hanging up in the air. When you are talking about Federal control, you are talking about control of a school board that makes the decisions; that board that hires and fires the teachers and administrators and makes policy, that handles the textbooks, and provides the curriculum and all those things. And, unless you have legislation which is designed and which in its normal functions will give someone the right to discharge those functions, you do not have Federal control. It has been my experience that at the school board level in our country we have democratic self-government at its best. I know of no area of public life where there is a greater interest by parent-teacher groups and by all our citizens in what goes on than at the school level in our government. I know of no area in our government or international life where outside intrusion is so instantly repelled by those who are charged with conducting these programs. I know of no area where those who are in charge of these programs are quicker to resent intrusions on their responsibilities and their prerogatives. So, I have no fear, as one who has served recently on a school board, of any Federal control or Federal interference out of this legislation. I have experienced contact with the Federal Government under programs such as Public Law 815, which is perhaps one of the most popular pieces of legislation that this Congress has ever enacted—and we had a great deal more Federal control in that program than you find in this—and I can say to you there was no Federal control on anybody in this very important area of responsibility. So, let us once and for all bury that myth of Federal control and let us confine ourselves to the real basic issues here, namely, whether there is a need, and if there is such a need, how we are to provide Federal help and guidance that is needed to stimulate our States and our local communities to tackle and solve this problem. That is what this bill would do, and I intend to support this legislation all the way.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HYDE].

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, no piece of legislation in the short time that I have had the honor to be a Member of this body has caused me as much struggle with my conscience as this one. I think there is no doubt that there is a need. I think also there is no doubt that there is a danger. Out of all the maze of argument that to which we have listened in the days this bill has been before us there are a few facts which seem to be self-evident.

One, that there is a need in many areas of this country for additional classrooms.

Two, that there is not a State in this Union which cannot afford to take care of that need.

I give that second reason as a fact because I have asked the United States Commissioner of Education, the officials in the National Education Association, and many other people in the field of education in a sincere effort to find out the facts and they have yet to name one State that cannot afford to pay for the schools that are needed.

Those two facts seem to make self-evident a third fact, and that is that the States simply are not doing the job they can and should do. And that, it seems to me, is the one and only justification for a vote in favor of this bill.

Now, why are the States not doing the job that they can and should do? They are not doing that job because the politicians in our State legislatures are not providing the taxes. And why are those men in the State legislatures not providing the taxes? Because at the ballot box the voters tell them that they do not want them to increase local taxes. When the State legislature raises the taxes or when the county commissioners raise the taxes, the taxes are an issue at the next election and the local politician can be and often is defeated on that issue, regardless of the fact that the taxes were raised for schools.

I can cite two examples in my own State, one involving a Democratic governor who passed new taxes to take care of the schools. At the next election that was the issue and he was defeated. Then a Republican government in my own county raised the taxes on the county level, providing more schools in 8 years than had been built in the entire history of that county for some 100-odd years and yet, in the 1954 election, the issue was taxes and that administration was defeated on that issue.

So the problem, like so many other problems—and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I think this needs to be said in this House—goes back to the people at home. For some reason or other the unfortunate fact seems to be that they feel that if they can get the money from the Federal level it will not cost them anything, but if they have to provide the money on the State or county level, it is going to come out of their own pocket and they cannot afford it. That, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, is the simple truth of this whole problem. If this legislation is just a temporary matter to attempt to get us over a hump, it seems to me that our duty as leaders in our community would be to go to the people and attempt to have them do the job they should do on the county and the State levels.

The people can pass resolutions in citizens' committees and PTA's and all those other places, but you and I know that there is one voice the legislator, whether he be on the county, State or national level, will listen to, and that is the voice of the ballot box. And when the people in their local elections, tell the legislators at the ballot box that they are more interested in keeping their taxes down than they are in providing more schools, then the results are going

to be those with which we are faced today.

So, Mr. Chairman, recognizing what I submit are some of the simple facts of life with which we are faced, it may be that if certain amendments to this proposed legislation are adopted I might go along with it on the theory, as has been said from this well a number of times, that it may be a stimulation to local action, because certainly some stimulation is needed for proper action on the county and State levels.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CRAMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

REQUEST FOR RELIEF TO THE SPANISH ALL-HAVANA CIGAR INDUSTRY OF TAMPA, FLA., FROM TARIFF REDUCTIONS GRANTED UNDER RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—PART I

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I have today addressed a request to the President of the United States asking that certain actions hereinafter described be taken to afford relief to the Spanish All-Havana Cigar Industry of Tampa, Fla., which manufactures 95 percent of the hand-made, class G, finest quality cigars in America.

This action was taken after a meeting and conference in my office this week with representatives of the Cigar Manufacturers Association of Tampa, Fla.; the International Cigar Makers Union; and all Government agencies concerned with the original negotiations and procedures under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of June 25, 1956.

A very critical situation will develop in the near future in this industry due to competition from the imported Havana manufactured cigars from Cuba which are given an advantage in profits through the reduction of tariffs effective July 1, 1956, which will inure in benefits not to the public at large by reduction of retail prices but to the distributor and for purposes of advertising which will lead to far greater promotion and competition of the imported product over the domestic and higher quality domestic cigar.

The recent Presidential proclamation making effective on July 1, 1956, the tariff reductions negotiated in Geneva reduced duties on Cuban cigars 15 percent over a 3-year period. I have heretofore filed a protest to this action.

The tremendous hardships imposed on this industry by the reduction of tariff duties on Cuban cigars was fully pointed out by representatives of the Tampa industry and representatives of the Cigar Makers International Union. It is clearly established that without some relief this could eventually mean the destruction of the All-Havana Cigar Industry in Tampa.

I believe the presentation made by the industry unquestionably justifies approval of the request.

This reduction negotiated at Geneva is the first time in over 50 years that duties have been reduced on Cuban cigars

adversely affecting this particular industry without a correlative reduction in Havana leaf imports to offset this competitive advantage. Since 1900, duties on Cuban cigars have had an established differential in relation to Cuban leaf tobacco, and a reduction in the duties of one has always been accompanied by a correlative reduction in the duties of the other. The Geneva negotiations reverse this established and long-justified relation which has been reflected in the various tariff acts and under the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, time and time again.

The Tampa cigar industry advises me that at this time the only relief which may be obtained with any reasonable expediency is a reduction in the duties on imported Cuban tobacco, the maximum of which, under the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act, can be 10 percent over the next 2 years. I wish to emphasize that, while the reduction in duties negotiated at Geneva grants to Cuban manufacturers a reduction of \$7 per thousand cigars, a 10-percent reduction in duties on imported tobacco leaf as a correlative concession to the domestic industry would mean to Tampa manufacturers a reduction of approximately 50 cents per thousand in cost of tobacco leaf for cigars. Although this provides hardly what could be termed reciprocal relief, it would be of some assistance and is strongly urged.

I feel that immediate action is necessary to grant maximum relief available under existing law to Tampa manufacturers. I feel confident that in the near future, in exploring this problem further and attempting to arrive at a more equitable solution through this and other means, the Tampa all-Havana cigar industry can be assisted.

Under figures available from the manufacturers of Tampa, the effective return to the industry of 10 percent reduction in tariffs would approximate \$169,289. As already has been pointed out, this amount would not equal the \$7 per thousand cigars benefit gained by the Cuban manufacturer but would place the Tampa industry in a better position to meet the competitive advantage which now seems imminent.

It is my earnest hope that the Members of this House and the executive agencies of the Government will realize and confirm the urgency of this situation and concur in my plea to the President and to those who at his direction may be requested to negotiate for this tariff reduction.

PART II

Mr. Chairman, I further request the following letter addressed to me be included as a part of the RECORD:

JUNE 18, 1956.

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER,
Member of Congress,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CRAMER: The Cigar Manufacturers Association of Tampa is writing you this letter asking that you take all proper steps to save from economic extinction the Spanish all-Havana cigar industry of Tampa and of Florida.

Under the terms of GATT, the United States State Department has without any

warning or notice to our industry, negotiated a 15-percent reduction in tariff rates on Cuban cigars imported into the United States. If not stopped this will most probably cause the destruction of the world renowned Tampa cigar industry manufacture of high quality "all-Havana" cigars. These new lower tariff rates do not become effective until a presidential proclamation is issued. It is understood that this may be done before June 30, 1956 when the new rates would become effective. Immediate action is necessary.

The seriousness of the situation cannot be understood. The jobs and livelihood of several thousand persons in Tampa are directly involved. The investments and labor of this Tampa industry for over one-half a century are at stake.

Product of Cuba

Present rate	Geneva 1956 agreement		
	1st stage	2d stage	3d stage
\$1.50 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem.	\$1.42 per pound plus 9½ percent ad valorem.	\$1.35 per pound plus 9 percent ad valorem.	\$1.27 per pound plus 8½ percent ad valorem.

There is no rational basis for this purely administrative action. Apparently it is now a national policy to succor foreign industry by the economic destruction of a long-established American industry. We invite your considerate thought of the following matters in determining the course of action to be taken which will save our industry.

II. THE TAMPA ALL-HAVANA SPANISH METHOD CIGAR INDUSTRY IS THE OLDEST SEGMENT OF THE CIGAR INDUSTRY IN THE UNITED STATES—IT WAS FOUNDED AND FOSTERED ON THE PREMISE THAT IT CAN EXIST ONLY WITH A PROTECTIVE TARIFF

When we speak of the all-Havana Spanish method of cigar manufacture, we speak of two things. First, cigars composed entirely of Cuban tobacco (i. e., the wrapper, the binder, and filler are all Cuban tobaccos), and secondly, cigars manufactured by the Spanish method—the slowest, most meticulous, and most expensive method of manufacture. This system originated in Cuba centuries ago.

Over 75 years ago the manufacture of all-Havana cigars commenced in Florida. This was done with the encouragement of the United States Government by its then existing protective tariff rates which were \$3 per pound plus 50 percent ad valorem. The cities of Tampa and Key West received their initial industrial impetus from this new cigar industry. The Federal Government over this entire period of time—and until recent date—has recognized that the Florida all-Havana industry can exist only with a protective tariff.

We wish to emphasize one thing—an all-Havana cigar, whether made in Tampa or Havana is identical. The types of tobacco are the same; the quality of the tobacco is the same, and the method of manufacture is the same. Most importantly, the workmanship is the same.

However, and we stress this point, the American consumer does not know this and 75 years of advertising has not been able to overcome this obstacle.

The American consumer considers all-Havana cigars no differently than many other commodities—when he sees the word "imported" and "made in Havana" he believes that cigar is superior to the Tampa-made cigar. This has been true for years. In 1913 the Tariff Act was amended to help overcome this—the cigar industry was given a special "bonded manufacturing warehouse" provision applicable only to factories making only cigars composed entirely of Cuban to-

The facts involved are these:

I. GATT WOULD REDUCE TARIFFS ON CUBAN CIGARS 15 PERCENT OVER A 3 YEAR PERIOD—WITH NO CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES ON OUR EXPORTS OF CIGARS TO OTHER COUNTRIES OR ON AMERICAN IMPORTS OF CIGAR LEAF TOBACCOS

The State Department, under the terms of GATT, negotiated an agreement granting other GATT nations a tariff reduction of 5 percent for each of 3 years on cigars imported into the United States. Present duty on Cuban cigars is \$1.50 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem. Under the full 15-percent reduction in tariff the duty will decrease to \$1.27 per pound plus 8½ ad valorem.

The following table shows the present and prospective duties upon imported cigars:

bacco. This was done under United States Government supervision and such manufacturer put a bonded stamp on each box which guaranteed that cigars were made entirely of Cuban tobaccos.

This competitive advantage of cigars made in Havana results in one basis consumer fact. If Tampa- and Havana-made cigars are offered to dealers and the consumer at the same price—there is a far greater acceptance of Havana-made cigars. The Tampa manufacturers have sought to overcome this by the best known method—offering more for the money. That is, not only are prices lower, but also the cigars are larger; that is, the cigars weigh more per thousand.

Actually, the workmanship of Tampa-made cigars is better than that of Havana—due to the fact that the Cuban Government in recent years enacted laws providing that Cuban cigars made for export could be manufactured by machine. The only cigars which may be manufactured by machine in Cuba are the cigars which are to be exported. This has resulted in over 80 percent of the all-Havana cigars made in Cuba and exported to the United States to be machine-made cigars. This was done by the Government of Cuba for the purpose of giving the Cuban manufacturers a competitive advantage over the all-Havana cigars made by the Tampa manufacturers. In turn, this has been one of the primary reasons compelling the Tampa manufacturers to go to the manufacture of all-Havana cigars by machine. This has resulted in unemployment of American workers—particularly in Tampa.

III. THE 1956 GENEVA CONFERENCE TARIFF REDUCTION ON CUBAN CIGARS THREATENS THE TAMPA ALL-HAVANA CIGAR INDUSTRY WITH DESTRUCTION

At the outset two things should be made clear. The all-Havana cigar is now and always has been the expensive, high-quality cigar. The all-Havana cigar, because of its high price, is competitive for practical purposes only with the all-Havana cigar of American manufacture. Moreover, in the United States there is a distinct market for the all-Havana cigars—a demand solely for the aroma and flavor of Havana tobaccos.

The all-Havana cigars made in Cuba and imported into the United States are practically all in the class G, excise tax bracket—i. e., the highest class—cigars retailing over 20 cents each. In 1955 approximately 99 percent of the Cuban cigars imported were in this class G.

Most of the all-Havana cigars made in the United States are manufactured in Tampa or in Florida. For example, in 1955 over 50 percent of all class G cigars sold in the United States were made in Tampa.

It has been recognized for many years—and reflected throughout various tariff acts—that a differential of at least 5 cents a cigar is necessary to maintain the competitive position of American-made cigars against Cuban cigars of the same quality. The studies of the Tariff Commission are replete with this information. The 1956 Geneva Conference, without any reason, has destroyed this long-recognized and existing differential. This convention has completely reversed the long-existent national tariff policy of the United States upon which the Tampa all-Havana cigar industry has been built and that this has been done without any warning or notice.

IV. UNDER PRESENT TARIFF RATES AMERICAN MADE CLASS G ALL-HAVANA CIGARS ARE LOSING A STEADILY INCREASED SHARE OF THE "CLASS G" AMERICAN MARKET TO CUBAN MADE CIGARS

Since 1903 Cuban made cigars have enjoyed preferential treatment by United States tariffs over the cigars of any other nation. Up until 1945 this is generally a 20 percent lower tariff than that of the cigars of other nations.

Since World War II the tariff on Cuban made cigars has twice been lowered relative with a reduction on tariffs on Cuban leaf tobaccos. These two reductions of tariffs on Cuban cigars amount to a total reduction of \$2.10 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem—a reduction in tariff of over 57 percent. (For example—present rates established in 1948 are \$1.50 per pound plus 10 percent ad valorem; prior to the 1945 reduction tariffs were \$3.60 per pound plus 20 percent ad valorem). Applied to 1955 average value and weights of imported Cuban cigars the present rates produce \$43.82 per thousand cigars—the pre-1945 rates would produce \$102.26 per thousand cigars).

Most importantly, under the existing tariff rates (i. e., the 1948 rates) cigars made in Cuba are capturing an increasingly greater share of the class G American cigar market. It is highly significant that this increase has been a steady one since the last reduction of tariff on Cuban cigars in 1948. Under the existing tariff rate the imported Cuban cigar, as a result of the tariff reductions since World War II is more than holding its own and proportionately, is capturing a great share of the class G all-Havana market than are the Tampa manufacturers of all-Havana class G cigars. Exhibit 1 attached to this letter shows the sale of class G cigars in 1948 and in 1955. This table shows that in this period of time the number of class G Cuban cigars sold has increased 44.5 percent. In the same period of time, the all-Havana class G cigars made by Tampa manufacturers has increased 36 percent. Expressed differently, proportionately speaking the imported Cuban cigar has increased its rate of sales nearly 23 percent more than have the Tampa manufacturers of all-Havana cigars. Certainly, the basis of experience shows that the existing tariff rates is providing a fair opportunity to the Cuban made cigar.

It is also important to note that during the year 1956 the importation of Cuban cigars has increased 12.5 percent in the last 12 months (i. e., 12 months ending March 31, 1956). This is greater than the rate of increase of class G all-Havana cigars made. Certainly, if tariff considerations and competition within the all-Havana cigar field are alone to be used as a criteria for the determination of the amount of tariffs to be applied, this would strongly indicate that the tariff on Cuban cigars should be increased rather than decreased.

The proposed 15 percent reduction amounting to \$7 per thousand on class G

cigars all-Havana Cuban-made cigars gives Cuban cigars an unfair advantage at the expense of the highest paid cigar workers in the United States. We do not know exactly how much lower rates are in Havana than they are in the Spanish system cigar factories of Tampa. We do know that the wage rates of the Tampa factories established under its contractual relations for many years with the Cigar Makers International Union are the highest wages in the cigar industry in the United States. This, despite the fact that the Tampa factories have long been in a disadvantageous financial position. Exhibit 2 attached hereto shows findings of independent wage arbitrators who have made findings with reference to the level of cigar wages in the Tampa Spanish factories, showing that they are the highest in the United States.

We estimate that the hourly wage rates and piece rates paid in Havana factories are in excess of 30 percent less than the corresponding rates in the Tampa Spanish factories. The labor costs of the Tampa Spanish factories are approximately 32 percent of gross sales (based upon an audit of a certified public accountant).

This means that the wage rates of these Havana Cuba factories are approximately 9.5 percent (of net sales) lower than the wage rates of factories in Tampa. Using for the net sales price of Havana cigars imported into the United States in 1955, their average value per thousand cigars (\$192.70) plus the tariff duties thereon (\$43.82) a "net selling price" of \$236.52 is determined for all-Havana class G cigars imported from Cuba. Upon this basis Cuban factories enjoy a wage cost of \$22.47 per thousand cigars lower than the corresponding wage costs of Tampa manufacturers (i. e., 9.5 percent of \$236.52).

We will furnish you with more accurate Cuban labor costs within a few days.

The Cuban manufacturer of cigars has other competitive advantages over the Tampa manufacturer. As heretofore mentioned the all-Havana cigars manufactured in Tampa weigh more per thousand cigars than competitive Cuban cigars. Using the 1948 Treasury Department Customs bonded warehouse figures, there is approximately 21½ pounds of tobacco in a Tampa made all-Havana cigar per thousand. In 1955 the Cuban cigars imported into the United States had an average weight of 17.70 pounds per thousand, a difference of 3.80 pounds of tobacco more per thousand cigars in the Tampa made cigars. Using the price of Havana stemmed filler tobacco as a basis of computation with at least \$1.75 per pound results in an additional competitive cost to Tampa manufacturers of \$6.65 per thousand cigars. There are many other additional cost factors involved such as higher city and county ad valorem taxes on buildings, equipment and inventory.

Apparently none of these factors are to be considered.

The proposed additional competitive favoritism to Cuban cigars of an additional \$7 per thousand cigars is more than the Tampa all-Havana manufacturers can stand and still survive.

V. THE \$7.50 PER THOUSAND TARIFF REDUCTION ON IMPORTED CUBAN CIGARS WILL IMMEDIATELY DESTROY WHAT REMAINS OF THE TAMPA HAND CIGAR INDUSTRY

We have heretofore pointed out that practically all of the Cuban cigars imported into the United States are made by machine in Cuba. Based upon a certified public accountant's audit of the 5 most popular class G all-Havana cigars made by 2 large Tampa manufacturers the net profit on these cigars before income taxes was 1.59 percent of net selling price, or \$2.86 per thousand. Obviously this \$7 per thousand reduction in tariff on Cuban cigars will destroy most of what remains of the hand cigar industry

in the all-Havana factories. It will be interesting to note what provision is going to be made for these workers displaced and the manufacturers destroyed by this governmental action and to what extent it will benefit the cigarworkers of Cuba.

The tariff reduction on Cuban cigars of \$7 per thousand will impose a competitive burden of \$650,000 per year on the Tampa all-Havana industry—which is a declining industry. Tampa manufacturers to maintain their competitive position will have to take competitive steps which will equal it in cost to the amount of the tariff reduction granted. This will amount to approximately \$650,000 per year. It is well known that the Tampa cigar industry is a declining industry—that is, the per capita consumption of cigars is declining annually. Less cigars are consumed now than were consumed in 1920. The records are replete with this information. It is obvious that the financial wherewithal does not exist to meet this additional favoritism granted to the Cuban manufacturers of cigars.

We think it worthy of your consideration that this administrative action of the executive department of the Government has been taken without a full study of the situation and has been taken by guess and by hearsay to destroy an old established industry of this city.

We also think it worthy of consideration that these Tampa manufacturers and their employees have paid and are paying taxes to support the foreign-aid program of this Nation which includes substantial grants of economic aid to foreign industries. We cannot conceive of a situation where we are on the one hand compelled to pay taxes in support of economic aid to foreign industries and at the same time be destroyed by the administrative fiat of our own Federal Government in its unilateral reduction of tariff duties of Cuban cigars.

This is a matter which affects thousands of people in this city and we think that if this action cannot be stopped that it should be announced what aid will be given to the displaced workers and to the destroyed industry of this city.

We will come to Washington to meet with you and any other departments of the Government at any time upon a few hours' notice. We solicit your counsel and support. We hope that you will use your good efforts with the executive department to prevent this action. Your cooperation will be very greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

CIGAR MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION
OF TAMPA,

By LOUIS LOPEZ, President.

EXHIBIT A

American-made all-Havana cigars under present tariff rates are losing a steadily increasing share of the class G market to Cuban-made cigars

[In thousands]

Year	Class	Price	Total manufactured, including imports	Cuban importation	Tampa manufacture
A	B	C	D	E	F
1955	All classes.....	Not over 2½ cents, over 20 cents.....	\$ 6,127,588	\$ 14,708	\$ 698,746
	G.....	Over 20 cents.....	186,520	14,536	107,241
1948	All classes.....	Not over 2½ cents, over 20 cents.....	\$ 5,688,089	\$ 10,220	\$ 524,399
	G.....	Over 20 cents.....	138,963	10,054	78,785

¹ Source: CMA of America letter report of Feb. 28, 1956.

² Source: CMA of America Bulletin No. 773 of June 13, 1956.

³ Source: Internal Revenue returns, Florida district.

⁴ Source: Estimated, based on 1954 percent of classes (exhibit 4, p. 13, CMA of America Statistical Record).

⁵ Source: Exhibit 4, 1954-55 CMA of America Statistical Record based on Annual Report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, U. S. Treasury Department, Bureau of Internal Revenue.

EXHIBIT B

Wage arbitration 1950-56 has conclusively shown:

1. Serious economic decline of members of CMA of Tampa, primary manufacturers of all-Havana cigars in the United States.
2. That members of CMA of Tampa pay highest labor rates in the United States.
3. That cigar workers are not suited for other type of work.

The following are pertinent conclusions of wage arbitrations from the opinions of: (1) Alfred A. Colby, arbitrator, appointed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 23, 1950; (2) Paul H. Sanders, arbitrator, appointed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 27, 1954; and (3) Robert T. Amis, arbitrator, appointed by Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, opinion on January 23, 1956.

I. SERIOUS ECONOMIC DECLINE OF MEMBERS OF CMA OF TAMPA, PRIMARY MANUFACTURERS OF ALL-HAVANA CIGARS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. Colby on January 23, 1950, after considering the excessive unreasonableness of union demands, said "I doubt if it was aware, before the calculable costs were analyzed, that almost \$1,500,000 would be added to labor costs of the manufacturers and that in a very short time the industry's entire capital would be wiped out and that the workers would be left without means of livelihood, particularly since practically all of them are unfitted for any other oc-

cupation, and this for so many reasons unnecessary to relate"; and further stated: "It is undisputed that a surplussage of labor exists in the Tampa cigar-manufacturing industry and that the industry is at the same time hard pressed with a steadily declining market for its products and with formidable competition of machine-made production at appreciable lower manufacturing costs. This is wholly aside from the inroads constantly made by changes in smoking habits and customers diversion to lower-priced competition and to other tobacco products."

Mr. Sanders on January 27, 1954, reiterated Mr. Colby's opinion in these words: "The association (CMA. of Tampa) in this case has presented considerable evidence to indicate that its economic position is not one to justify further increases. . . . There was testimony by the manufacturers and exhibits M, R, and T, indicating the not-too-favorable position of the industry and of these manufacturers particularly."

And further said in considering the union demands "the arbitrator is of the opinion that the factors relating to the economic conditions of the industry are of particular importance in considering whether this expense should be added at this particular time."

And Mr. Amis on January 23, 1956, noted the same serious economic condition saying "According to manufacturers' testimony association factories are not in a position to increase wholesale prices of cigars due to

competitive conditions. Accepting this statement."

II. THAT MEMBERS OF CMA OF TAMPA PAY HIGHEST LABOR RATES IN UNITED STATES

Mr. Sanders on January 27, 1954, found that the members of the CMA of Tampa pay the highest labor rates in the United States, saying "when it is borne in mind that their rates are accepted as being the best in the industry."

And Mr. Amis on January 23, 1956, with great particularity noted the highest labor rates, saying "when compared to the national trend, association hand cigarmakers have for the past 2 years increased their weekly earnings 17 percent more than have all United States cigar workers and approximately 4.9 percent over other cigar workers in Hillsborough County, Fla." And further noted "Average hourly earnings in the Tampa area for pickers and packers (men) is \$1.43 as compared to national figures of \$1.39 or 4 cents and .029 percent higher. Average hourly earnings in the Tampa area for pickers and packers (women) is \$1.67 as compared to the national figure of \$1.21 or 46 cents and 38 percent higher."

III. THAT CIGAR WORKERS ARE NOT SUITED FOR OTHER TYPE WORK

Quoting again from Mr. Colby's opinion on January 23, 1950: "I doubt if it was aware, before the calculable costs were analyzed, that almost \$1,500,000 would be added to labor costs of the manufacturers and that in a very short time the industry's entire capital would be wiped out and that the workers would be left without means of livelihood, particularly since practically all of them are unfitted for any other occupation and this for so many reasons unnecessary to relate."

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. FLYNT].

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill H. R. 7535, the short title of which describes it as the "School Construction Assistance Act of 1955."

I am opposed to it for many reasons. I am opposed to it primarily because I believe this question of Federal control of education is more than a myth. I think that danger is real. I think that it is both vicious and treacherous.

In this connection I think that no one here can deny or will seek to deny that under the long-established concept of control of public education on the State and local level we have brought about and it has caused us to have the finest and best system of public education ever devised by the brain and purpose of man.

I do not think that any other nation in any part of the world or in any phase of world history has ever brought about or devised a system of public education which comes anywhere near to equaling that which we have in this country. I think it is largely because we have carefully controlled the education of our boys and girls on as near a local level as possible that we have been able to bring about in this Nation a greater way of life than has ever been known by any other people in the entire history of civilized man.

I believe this control which we fear and which we deprecate is real. I think it is a menace. As stated by many of my colleagues here today, I believe this bill in its present form is simply getting the nose of the camel under the tent. Once Federal aid is proposed for the

construction of classrooms and public schools in this country it will not be long before the same people who sponsor this particular legislation, those who operate down in the Office of the Commissioner of Education, will be coming before this Congress asking for funds to supplement teachers' salaries, and to have the Federal Government pay and bear a portion and perhaps eventually all of the cost of the operation and maintenance of every public school in this country. Then control of our schools will be lodged down there on Independence Avenue instead of in the byways and highways of America, which have made this Nation great.

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BAILEY. May I ask the gentleman, if a legislative act by the Congress was the correct and proper one in 1836, is it wrong in 1956? In explanation of the question, let me say that during the administration of Andrew Jackson in 1836 the Congress found itself with \$40 million of surplus money. A law was passed distributing that money on a population basis to the several States, and the gentleman's State of Georgia got \$1 million and spent it for school construction. If it was right in 1836, how can it be wrong in 1956?

Mr. FLYNT. I think that the gentleman from West Virginia has already answered his own question when he referred to the surplus of \$40 million at that time whereas now there is a debt of \$281 billion and it will probably be greater in the future. Bear in mind that the national debt is greater than the combined debts of all of the States and subdivisions of government.

Mr. BAILEY. They tell us that we are going to have a surplus of \$2 billion this year.

Mr. FLYNT. I think that is wishful thinking on the part of a lot of people and I do not think the gentleman from West Virginia goes along with that line of thinking at this time or any other time.

But, in connection with this question of Federal control which I feel about very deeply and which I deprecate, I believe most strongly that once the Federal Government gets into the business of providing funds for any phase of education, it will gradually preempt the field of public education as it has preempted every field in which the Federal Government has entered during your lifetime and mine. I can think of nothing worse than having the curricula in the public-school systems in each of the 48 States supervised directly by remote control from a little ivory tower—the Office of the Commissioner of Education—in Washington. I think it would be one of the things that would most effectively destroy the basic principle of the separation of powers between the States and the Federal Government. Bear this in mind. Once these powers are yielded by the States and the local instrumentalities and subdivisions of government to the Federal Government, or usurped by the Federal Government, there never

will be any recalling them back because once they are gone, they are gone forever.

I think the time has come for us to seriously and carefully reappraise this system of taking away from the States one by one each and everyone of the reserve powers of the States. We have now reached the point where just about the only authority that the States have left lies in the field of public education. If, and when, this is gone, along with it may go the last of the sacred, reserved powers and rights of the several sovereign States. If, and when, this time comes and if, and when, the right to run our own schools is preempted by the Federal Government, we might as well realize that the next thing will be the partial, if not complete, destruction of the right of the State legislatures to legislate, and the right of the State courts to judicially pass upon those things which have historically been reserved to the several States. It has been said, and I think it well to repeat here: "Leave to the control of the States those things which the States can best do for themselves." If this bill passes, we shall completely and directly reverse a traditional and historic concept of control of public education by the States on a local level. If, and when, this is done, we will be going one step further toward the accomplishment of the goal of those, whoever they may be, and in whatever positions of power they find themselves, who seek by one more method and by one more movement to destroy the States and reduce them to mere administrative agencies of an all-powerful central Federal Government. I hope that time never comes because, Mr. Chairman, if, and when, that happens and the States are reduced to mere administrative agencies of an all-powerful Federal Government, you will see the rights and liberties and personal freedom of all our citizens wherever they may live destroyed along with those rights of the several States. I expect to oppose this bill in the form in which it now is. I can think of very few, if any, amendments which could cause me to cast my vote in favor of it, with the possible exception of the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLYNT. I yield.

Mr. MARSHALL. I have been very interested in the gentleman's statement. Since the Federal Government has had a direct responsibility in the funds provided for the education of the American Indians, does the gentleman think the Federal Government has done an outstanding job?

Mr. FLYNT. I certainly do not think the Federal Government has done a good job in that field or in any other field of public education in which it is now engaged up until this time. The complete failure of the Federal Government to provide a decent educational system for the American Indians is the best warning we can ever have concerning the effect of Federal intervention in and control of public education.

I hope that this measure will not be enacted into law.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have never more earnestly wished for the eloquence of a Churchill, a Jefferson or a Lincoln than at this moment of addressing the House on the measure now before us.

The legislation we are considering—to provide much needed Federal assistance to the States for school construction—in spirit, goes far beyond the material good it would accomplish.

Here is an opportunity for the Congress to fulfill its moral obligation to give leadership, direction and purpose to the thinking of our people in a moment of national need.

I most prayerfully hope that in our deliberations we shall put aside political and sectional differences and preconceived ideas, in order that we may serve the youth of this Nation as wisely, as well and as faithfully as we would serve the Nation itself.

Every one of the 48 States, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico—everything we know and think of as the United States of America—is today encountering overwhelming difficulties in adjusting its educational programs and systems to the demands of this modern age.

A major problem is created by the fact that this Nation is blessed with more children of school-age than the States presently have schoolrooms—or can immediately afford to build schoolrooms—to accommodate them.

A problem of equal concern springs from their inability to engage adequate teaching staffs at the low salaries they are able to pay.

Here are some of the pertinent facts which have swelled the educational problems of our States and local communities to crisis proportions:

These facts have been verified by the Committees on Education and Labor of the 81st, the 82d, the 83d, and now, the 84th Congresses—they have been substantiated by the White House, the governors of the 48 States and the United States Office of Education—accepted by the people—and publicized by the press.

In my own State, whose problems I, of course, know best, the Honorable W. W. Trent, State superintendent of schools, testified in 1954 before the Special Subcommittee on Federal Aid for School Construction, as follows:

School construction in West Virginia, curtailed by the depression, almost stood still from 1933 to 1949. Two factors contributed to this lag, the depression itself (followed by the war and material shortages), and the constitutional limitation of taxes that resulted in the transfer from local districts to the State the financing of the major part of the public schools.

In 1950 a constitutional amendment permitted bonding up to 3 percent of valuation, and the State appropriated \$10 million for school building aid. However, this amount did not catch up with the wornout buildings, nor did it enable the State to build enough schools to meet new enrollments. Small counties have for the most part been

unable to construct buildings, and still do not have sufficient bonding capacities to catch up.

In the State, as a whole, there is a total current need for 2,823 classrooms, and by 1960, the need will have mounted to over 3,700. The estimated total cost, figuring \$31,800 per room, including furniture and fixtures, is \$119,727,000.

Subtracting the total possible bonding capacity of all the counties from this need, a deficit of about \$60 million faces West Virginia. Added to this must be the money needed for purchasing and improving sites, about \$3 million more, making the total need over \$63 million.

In conclusion, West Virginia feels that the counties and the State cannot, within reasonable measures or possible resources, maintain adequate school terms with prepared teachers and, at the same time, finance the construction of sufficient buildings to house the pupils of the State.

Nationwide, the situation is even graver, as shown by the 1953 United States Office of Education report on conditions of school housing and the need for additional facilities in 43 States, followed, in 1954, by the National Education Association's report of its findings.

Since the 81st Congress appropriated \$3 million to aid the States in carrying out a nationwide inventory of existing school facilities, surveys, statewide studies, regional conferences and national conferences have kept the problems alive but have failed to remedy the condition.

The facts remain unchanged. While the critical shortage of classrooms continues, and teaching staffs diminish, our blessings continue to multiply.

This past fall—1955—enrollment in the elementary schools increased 24.1 percent over 1950. In the high schools the increase in 1955 over 1950 was 18.9 percent. However, according to the Office of Education estimate, at the beginning of 1954 there was already a deficit of more than 300,000 classrooms.

Meanwhile, as the report accompanying H. R. 7535, from the Committee on Education and Labor of the House, so succinctly states:

The rate of construction has more than kept pace with mounting enrollment, but it has only slightly reduced the total classroom deficit. As a consequence, millions of children still attend schools which are unsafe, or which permit learning only part-time, or under serious conditions of overcrowding.

In other words, Mr. Chairman, run as fast as we can—at our present pace—we are only standing still.

What disturbs me even more than our lack of schoolrooms and our continued dependence upon obsolete buildings and firetraps, are the limitations placed upon the educational opportunities the schools can offer our children under these present circumstances.

The future of this Nation, Mr. Chairman, does not depend upon the amounts Congress can appropriate for fighter planes, guided missiles, foreign aid, research and development programs and even health and other public services—as important as these are.

For the plane to fly, there still has to be a skilled human hand; and leaning over the test tube and the drawing board, there must be a trained, scientific mind.

Already we are suffering from a dearth of both skilled and trained men and women. So that, quite literally, within the next 2 decades, the fate of this Nation and its destiny will be in the hands of the 5-year old who enrolled in kindergarten this past fall.

In a speech before the District of Columbia Chapter of the West Virginia University Alumni Association on May 17, 1956, here is what Dr. C. B. Joliffe, vice president and technical director of the Radio Corporation of America, had to say on this subject:

The increasing complexity of our machines, systems, and techniques has created an ever greater demand for skilled people to produce, install, and maintain them. The broader knowledge that has come from research has created a growing demand for more research workers with more specialized training. In an economy dedicated to growth through innovation, we must equip a constantly greater number of our young people with these skills or suffer a serious—if not a fatal—reverse.

I feel strongly that this is the great problem of our time. * * * Even if there were no threat whatever from abroad, we should still be deeply concerned by the fact that while 30,000 engineering graduates were turned out by our universities in 1952, the total in 1955, after 3 more years of rapid technological growth, was only 23,000.

Industry, science, and the professions are most concerned that our schools are not turning out sufficient numbers of engineers, technologists, researchers, chemists, and physicists.

There is no longer any great demand for unskilled labor, and the untrained worker is finding it more and more difficult to earn his livelihood. Unless we make a more vigorous effort to expand the educational opportunities of all our people, the need to support the ignorant, the illiterate, and the untrained could eventually place an intolerable burden upon our entire society.

On the other hand, I am equally concerned that the education we now provide for our children will not produce the well-rounded and informed citizens whose intellectual curiosity, skills, and training will be required to keep the ideals of our democracy and the spirit of our freedom alive tomorrow.

In passing H. R. 7535, Mr. Chairman, we shall be neither violating a tradition nor establishing a precedent. During the economic depression of the 1930's, the Federal Government provided large-scale financial assistance to communities throughout the Nation for the construction of public schools. The Public Works Administration made allotments from July 1933, through June 1942, for 6,687 elementary and secondary school-building projects costing nearly \$1 billion.

Antedating the Constitution, Federal aid to school construction actually began with the early land and monetary grants made by the Congress of the Confederation—1785—for the support of education in States formed from the public domain. And later, by act of the Congress of the United States, education in each new State admitted to the Union received an endowment of public lands and—in some cases—monetary grants derived from the sales of public lands.

So let us lay once and for all, Mr. Chairman, the ancient bogey that "Federal aid leads to Federal control." It has not happened in 200 years and it is even less likely to happen now. On so flimsy a pretext, let us not deny to our children the equal and enriched educational opportunities that are the birthright of every American child.

A vast audience is sitting in silent judgment upon the 84th Congress as it debates this first vital step toward remedying our sorry educational problems. The really interested parties to this legislation, however—the children of America—are not present, nor do they have a voice in these proceedings. Yet it is their future—their lives—we are deciding here.

When they are grown to man's estate, when they have reached maturity, when they must take our places here, how shall they judge us? Will these future generations of America's citizens condemn us for our blindness and indifference? Or will they honor the record of the 84th Congress of the United States for its progressiveness, its wisdom, and its vision?

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. My sincere thanks to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

This week a several-page letter from the American Legion was placed on my desk, and I understand each Member received a copy of the same letter. Therefore, it seems desirable to read the following telegrams which I received this afternoon from three veterans organizations.

From Kenneth M. Birkhead, executive director, American Veterans Committee, comes this telegram:

The American Veterans Committee denies implication made by American Legion that veterans oppose aid to school construction. We doubt that Legion members themselves are opposed to this Federal program. President Eisenhower is one Legion member favoring aid to schools. With one-half Nation's schoolchildren, sons and daughters of veterans, we do not believe that veterans want their children to receive their education in crowded unsanitary and unsafe classrooms. AVC urges full support of Federal aid to school construction bill.

From Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director, Veterans of Foreign Wars national legislative service, comes this telegram:

On behalf of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I reiterate the statement in my letter of February 21, 1955, to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare with respect to the school construction program to the effect that our organization approves direct Federal participation in the school construction program and believe the Congress is in best position to determine extent of the need.

From John R. Holden, national legislative director of the AMVETS, comes the following telegram:

The American Veterans of World War II and Korean AMVETS urge your active support of legislation to provide Federal aid for school construction. In view of indications that schools in the United States have fallen far behind both the aspirations of the American people and their capabilities, it is essential that legislation of this nature be

enacted. Your continued effort on its behalf is sincerely appreciated.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that these three fine organizations, joining many, many other national groups who are urging Federal aid in school construction, should be commended.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

In conclusion, I would like to make 1 or 2 comments. I have noticed all through the debate that the general discussion has been toward the title that deals with grants-in-aid. I cannot emphasize strongly enough that the big hope of this entire legislative proposal resides in sections other than those dealing with grants.

The main purpose and the ultimate goal is to stimulate State and local action. If this legislation will not do that, then I feel we have failed in the major part of our endeavor. Control of our schools by the Federal Government is undesirable and unthinkable and not in the tradition of America. We all strongly feel that way. In this present program, which we admit is a limited one, every safeguard that we can think of has been placed in the legislation to insure that the Federal Government will not be controlling the running of the school systems of America. If it can be brought out clearly that there are certain parts that may cause such a situation, I will be one only too glad to consider changes in those sections. Our main objective is to eliminate classroom deficiencies that have accumulated in America, not only because of some State and local inaction, but also because of national and international situations.

We have never been able in the normal way to catch up with the classroom shortages, and this is a measure designed of a temporary nature in order to make up for those deficiencies and to put our school system, as far as the facilities are concerned, on a normal operating basis so that the States and local communities can carry on.

Let me close with this one thought: Our whole aim is to not only preserve the welfare of our children but also the intrinsic worth of our American Republic.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 6 minutes remaining.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have the right to extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that my congressional district will be hard hit by inadequate school facilities in the near future. The people from my State are proud and have not waited for the Government to pass a Federal aid to school construction bill—they have built new schools in the areas

where there was a need for them. Even with this community pride and zeal to provide proper education for their children, the school system is not adequate, and in 5 more years, with the rate of development in the middle and northwest going at the pace at which it is now traveling, our schools will not begin to fill the needs of our children.

I would like to go on record in support of H. R. 7535, the school construction bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to discuss for a moment the subject of my remarks in the opening of this debate, pertaining to the amendment which I propose to offer. The amendment I think has been read and everyone is familiar with it. It rewrites section 103 in such a way as to very briefly set out just exactly what the six pages it proposes to strike out will do without the objectionable features that have been complained about all during this debate.

For your information I include it in full at this point in my remarks:

Page 3, strike out line 21 and all that follows through line 10 on page 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"PAYMENTS OF STATE ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 103. The Commissioner shall pay the State allotment for any fiscal year, or so much thereof as the State educational agency requests, to the State educational agency upon certification by it that the amount to be paid does not exceed one-half of the cost of constructing the school facilities for which such funds are to be expended. Funds paid to a State educational agency under this section shall be expended solely for construction of school facilities in the State, and shall be used to pay not more than one-half of the total cost of constructing all school facilities in the State which are assisted under this title.

"JUDICIAL REMEDY

"SEC. 104. (a) The district court of the United States for any district in which the capital of a State is located shall have jurisdiction, as provided in this section, to grant appropriate relief in any case where any funds paid to the State under this title have been or are about to be expended in violation of this act.

"(b) An action under this section shall be brought in the name of the United States by the United States attorney for the district involved, and shall be brought against the State. The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure shall apply.

"(c) The court may grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems appropriate pending final disposition of any action under this section. If in any such action it is determined that any funds paid to the State under this title have been or are about to be expended in violation of section 103, the court shall grant a permanent injunction or other appropriate relief, including restitution of any funds so expended, or such part thereof as may be just and equitable under the circumstances of the case."

I might say that this has been a rather unusual experience for me. I have had much comment upon the amendment. I think I have never sponsored any piece of legislation or an amendment that seemed to be so acceptable to so many; but the strange thing about it is that so many have said to me: "I am a little skeptical about voting for the amendment, because if that is adopted the bill would be so good I will probably have to vote for it."

I do hope that idea will not gain headway, for I think I said at the outset that my very purpose and the very thing that prompted me to introduce this amendment was that if the bill becomes law it should be in the best possible form.

Members would say: "Why did you have this idea? Why did you prepare this amendment?" There is not a single member of this committee but what recalls exactly what prompted me. In the instigation of the school impact law we incorporated language intended to take care of the situation where the military had abandoned a base or post and there were not enough children left to operate an on-base school. So we extended to the United States Commissioner of Education some discretionary power under which he could arrange for those children to be accepted in adjacent State schools. What did he do?

He came out with an order that closed the Quantico High School where there was the best housing and one of the finest schools we know anything about and ordered those children to be scattered around over the State of Virginia. Some of them had to be hauled 20 miles. I called upon him, I begged him, I reasoned with him, and pointed out that they had a fine school, a fine teaching staff, well organized and with plenty of building space. It was an economical operation and a practical operation. Then I sought him out again for a conference between us. The ranking minority member of the committee, Mr. McCONNELL, did the same thing. No, he was going to close it. I said, "Dr. Brownell, there can be but one result. It will be embarrassing to you and inconvenient to the committee."

We had to bring them before the committee. We introduced a bill. A hearing was held before the committee. There was not a member of that committee who thought it was even good sense to close that school. But we had to bring a bill last year to the floor of this House. The House passed it, the Senate passed it and the President signed it. To do what? To force this same United States Commissioner of Education to do the will of Congress.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor if he does not recall that Dr. Brownell testified, and so did counsel for the Department, that Dr. Brownell had made that ruling under advice of the counsel? I am not saying that the counsel was right, but at the same time there seemed to be involved some misinterpretation of the law. Perhaps we should get new lawyers, but let us let up on the Commissioner.

Mr. BARDEN. In this case the Commissioner's interpretation substituted the word "available" for the word "suitable." No other lawyer had ever interpreted it that way, no other Commissioner of Education had ever put that interpretation on it. There are some pretty good lawyers on my committee and not one of them put that interpretation on it.

I desire at this time to read a part of the Senate report which accompanied H. R. 3253, a bill which was passed solely to prevent the Commissioner's order from going into effect:

His interpretation has the effect of substituting the word "available" for the word "suitable" in the law as it exists now. The committee does not believe that Congress intended such a narrow construction of this section. Since the Commissioner of Education has insisted on such a narrow interpretation of the present law, the committee is of the opinion that remedial legislation must be enacted.

In addition I wish to quote from House Report No. 736, 84th Congress, which was filed in connection with the same bill, H. R. 3253, as follows:

After full consideration of all the circumstances in this case, your committee does not believe that the Commissioner's action in this matter conforms with the intent of Congress as expressed in Public Law 874 and subsequent amendments. The committee believes that under the full circumstances of this case, local educational facilities are not now "suitable" for the free public education of students residing on the Quantico Marine Corps base. The committee does not agree that under the law the Commissioner is forbidden to look prospectively at such a situation. Members of the committee, as these excerpts from the hearing record show, literally pleaded with the Commissioner and his aides to take a broader and more reasonable view of the matter, so that legislative action would not be required.

If we have this much trouble over one school, what may we expect from the powers granted the same administrator, the United States Commissioner of Education. If we grant him the power contained in H. R. 7535, beginning with section 103 on page 3 and including sections 104, 105, and 106 which involves all 48 States of this Union. The basic law creating the Office of United States Commissioner of Education never intended that he should be either a powerful administrator or have any such powers over the school facilities, construction, or administration.

So in the name of safety and wise legislation I offer this amendment, and I hope it will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the first section of the bill.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7535) to authorize Federal assistance to the States and local communities in financing an expanded program of school construction so as to eliminate the national shortage of classrooms, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced

that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

- S. 245. An act for the relief of Ahmet Haldun Koca Taskin;
- S. 1375. An act for the relief of Pingfong Ngo Chung and Pearl Wah Chung;
- S. 1814. An act for the relief of Teresa Lucia Cilli and Giuseppe Corrado Cilli; and
- S. 2842. An act for the relief of Toini Margareta Heino.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 10986) entitled "an act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to amendments Nos. 1, 3, and 4 of the House to the bill (S. 1622) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make payment for certain improvements located on public lands in the Rapid Valley unit, S. Dak., of the Missouri River Basin project, and for other purposes," disagrees to amendment No. 2, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MURRAY, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. WATKINS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

REPORT ON H. R. 10269

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means may have until midnight Saturday, June 30, 1956, to file a report on the bill H. R. 10269.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

LUMP-SUM READJUSTMENT PAYMENT FOR MEMBERS OF THE RESERVE COMPONENTS

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 9952) to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after "duty," insert "after the enactment of this section and."

Page 2, line 5, strike out all after "year," down to and including "disregarded," in line 8 and insert: "For the purposes of computing the amount of readjustment payment (1) a part of a year that is six months or more is counted as a whole year, and a part of a year that is less than six months is disregarded, and (2) any prior period for which severance pay has been received under any other provision of law shall be excluded. There shall be deducted from any lump-sum readjustment payment any mustering-out pay received under the provisions of the Mustering-Out Payment Act of 1944 or the Veterans Readjustment Assistance Act of 1952."

Page 2, line 16, after "Defense," insert "or by the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to members of the Coast Guard when the Coast Guard is not operating as a service in the Navy."

Page 2, lines 18 and 19, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 2, line 23, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 3, lines 3 and 4, strike out "would be" and insert "is."

Page 3, lines 10, 11, and 12, strike out "subsequently become entitled under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration" and insert "become entitled, on the basis of subsequent service, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today is a day which will live long in the minds and memories of free men. It is the anniversary of the birth of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish musician, statesman and patriot.

It is in like manner a day on which the indomitable will of the Polish people to be free has made itself felt again after years of oppression and slavery at the hands of godless nazism and atheistic Russian communism.

Untold hundreds of thousands of Poles have been imprisoned, exiled, tortured, and killed during these long years, and yet today we read how the Polish people have risen in the industrial city of Poznan and other places in Poland in expression of this spirit of freedom.

Newspaper accounts are necessarily brief, and do not give the full details because of the Communist censorship. The situation is such that Radio Warsaw has called this a "well-organized revolt," but has said also that the "rebellion has been overcome and the guilty will be punished severely." Perhaps the revolt has failed and no doubt ruthless reprisals are forthcoming, but they will not kill this enduring spirit. It is clear from reports that it was a general strike, and that Communist headquarters and government buildings were attacked. Communist flags have been torn down and a jail burned and prisoners freed.

The citizens of Poznan made their protest at a time when foreign visitors were present for a trade fair. The Poles cried to foreign visitors to "tell the outside world what you have seen. We want things to become better, and we want the Soviets to disappear."

Other reports indicate that revolt is continuing and spreading, and that these unarmed heroes are seizing Army tanks. No doubt reports of unrest elsewhere are and have been stifled.

I join them in their wish for freedom, and I pray that their revolt will result in liberation for themselves and their brothers imprisoned by the Communists in other so-called "people's republics" behind the Iron Curtain.

Now is the time for America to make a strong statement reiterating the fact that we stand squarely behind the principle of self-determination for Poland and other captive nations. We must cease compromise with the Soviets over the slavery of these peoples and must so announce to the world. I hope that our President and Secretary of State will not only proclaim that it is the policy of the United States to push with all available means to secure self-determination and with it freedom and liberty for all those held behind the Iron Curtain, but will also actively pursue such a course by all means short of war.

Such a policy would be a real tribute to the late distinguished Paderewski and to the thousands of other Poles who are desperately struggling to achieve that freedom with their blood and lives.

THE LATE FLEET ADMIRAL ERNEST J. KING, UNITED STATES NAVY

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, as I watched the extremely impressive funeral procession for Fleet Admiral King as it passed in front of the United States Capitol, the thought occurred to me that this very great sailor and this distinguished admiral of our Navy was making his last voyage to the Capitol prior to leaving for Annapolis where he will rest and receive the admiration and respect of thousands upon thousands for the rest of time. Many of us remember his official calls at the Capitol during the war.

Fleet Admiral Ernest J. King was, without question, one of the great naval commanders and leaders in all history. He was our great Chief of Naval Operations during World War II and also our great Commander in Chief of the entire United States Fleet during this gigantic struggle. Taking over these two great responsibilities after Pearl Harbor when our Navy and our country suffered from one of the most devastating blows in our history, Admiral King brought a clear mind, steel courage, unshakable determination, and firm decision, not only to the United States Navy but to the Nation as a whole. His force, tremendous ability, and power of decision soon marshalled our Navy into a fighting unit that struck blow after blow after blow for victory. During his leadership he built the United States Navy into the greatest naval fighting force in the world. Throughout his long career of 59 years as a sailor and a leader of men, Admiral King distinguished himself in serving

his country as the kind of a commanding officer who rises to the leadership of mankind only once in generations. Fortunate, indeed, was the United States Navy and the United States of America that when the time required a great leader he was there and in position to take command.

As I watched the impressive march of the sailors in white, the precision of the company of marines, and the performance of the great Navy and Marine bands, I was deeply impressed with the solemn respect that was being shown to this wartime leader of the Navy. It seemed as if the Navy were saying, "Admiral King, you have led us through many rough and dangerous seas and it is now our great privilege and honor to lead you on your last voyage." The respect rendered by the military services was inspiring and this inspiration was almost as deep as the inspiration Adm. Ernest King gave to America in the dark days of 1941 and 1942. This inspiration will never die, for it will be always a part of young men who follow in his footsteps as officers of our Navy.

Impressive, too, was the presence there of some of those great officers of the Navy, some of those great fighting leaders in those historic sea struggles of World War II, to pay their respects and to lead their old chief on his last voyage. There was Fleet Admiral Nimitz, Fleet Admiral Halsey, Fleet Admiral Leahy, and many, many other distinguished flag officers. They were all on deck Friday afternoon, for in their hearts they knew one of the greatest of America's fighting men and one of the greatest of our country's leaders was stepping down for all time. Admiral King would be one of the first to say that no leader can accomplish gigantic deeds without great men at his side. These men and many others have earned their place in history and were at the admiral's side to the very end.

With his place in history secure, the deeds and accomplishments of Admiral King will never cease to be important. Always he will be an inspiration to American fighting men. If the time should ever come again when our great Navy must sail into action against an enemy, somewhere ahead of the ships in the sea mist will be the image of Admiral King still leading, still commanding.

To have led the United States Navy in the greatest of human conflicts not only was a tremendous task but it was also a great privilege and a great honor. Admiral King was always proud he was an American and America will be grateful forever as a country and as a people that Admiral King commanded the United States Navy. He steered the course to victory at sea.

America is proud of its great leaders. In the days to come may America never forget the tremendous inspiration of the leadership of Admiral King. Let it be preserved through the ages for all America in the form of a fitting monument in the Nation's Capital. Already enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen, this great monument will stand as a lasting and inspiring tribute to the glory and magnificence of the Nation's wartime naval leader, Fleet Adm. Ernest J. King.

PADEREWSKI DAY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this 29th day of June, which has been designated "Paderewski Day," I wish to join with my colleagues in tribute to Poland's great musician, patriot, and statesman.

Ignace Paderewski will perhaps be best remembered as a great concert pianist. His debut was in Vienna in 1887 and this was followed by brilliant performances in Paris, London, and Berlin. Having captured the hearts of Europeans, he traveled to America in 1891 and proceeded to do the same here. In concert after concert he played to capacity houses. He became the musician of the many as he traveled through the country. This instrumental artist even thrilled the unmusical, and it has been said that the test of a musician's genius is his power over the unmusical. American critics compared him with Liszt and Rubinstein. As he traveled through our country, he also came to love it, for her people were allowed to live freely and to enjoy liberty. Such was not the case in his native Poland.

Paderewski's talents were not confined to music; he was also a patriot. Through his music he was able to advance Poland's cause for independence. For over a hundred years, Poland had been partitioned amongst Prussia, Russia, and Austria, but Paderewski never gave up hope of seeing his native land unified. This dream was to be realized soon after the end of the First World War.

It was during the war that Paderewski saw Poland's opportunity to break the shackles that bound her. He came to America to arouse American interest in Polish freedom. He had triumphed over American musical critics but now he faced the more difficult task of convincing politicians and statesmen on a different subject—that Poland should be free and independent. He traveled across the continent and in speeches in universities, concert halls, and theaters—usually combined with Chopin's music—he advanced the Polish dream for independence. Chiefly through his efforts large sums of money were collected to aid his devastated homeland, and the American people opened their hearts for the Polish cause. In recognition of his patriotic devotion to this country, the American Poles chose him as their plenipotentiary to act for them and decide all political matters in their names.

Although Paderewski had convinced many Americans that Poland should be free, he also saw the necessity of getting President Wilson interested in his pleas for the Polish people. In the summer of 1916, he was invited to the White House. By playing Chopin's music—which revealed the true Polish spirit—he opened the subject of Poland's freedom and in a conversation that followed, he succeeded in gaining Wilson's sym-

pathy. President Wilson was impressed with Paderewski's devotion and generosity for his country. In subsequent meetings Wilson assured the Polish patriot that he was confident that Poland would be resurrected and would be free again.

Time proved that Paderewski's conversations with Wilson would be fruitful. On January 22, 1917, in an address before the Senate, President Wilson said:

Statesmen everywhere are agreed that there should be a united, independent, and autonomous Poland.

And a year later when his 14 points were announced his 13th stated:

An independent Polish state should be erected * * * which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea.

Paderewski had secured America's support. As soon as the war was over, Paderewski left the United States and returned to Poland to press Poland's claim for independence. It was largely through his efforts that the various factions in Poland were unified and a coalition government was established to represent Poland at the Paris Peace Conference. He became Premier and Foreign Minister of this coalition government. He was, also, the chief Polish delegate at the peace conference.

At Paris, Paderewski the musician and patriot proved that he was also a statesman. Secretary of State Lansing said that he had the innate genius for political leadership. He succeeded in outlining the boundaries of Poland along much the same lines as discussed with Wilson during the war. He urged the conference to establish the Polish Corridor giving Poland access to the sea. When Paderewski signed the Versailles Treaty, his dream of an independent Poland was finally realized. Poland once more was in the family of nations.

Having accomplished his purpose of establishing a unified and independent Poland and worn from his patriotic struggle, Paderewski retired from public life. He returned to the music he loved so well, and once more thrilled the world. In 1939, he made his last tour to America—his 20th. During this tour he suffered a heart attack which forced him to retire from music.

It was while he was in retirement in Switzerland that Germany and Russia dismembered Poland again. Once more Paderewski answered the call of his country in distress and accepted, on January 11, 1940, the Presidency of the exiled Polish National Council in France. In September of that same year, against the advice of his physician he returned to America to carry on his fight for his beloved country. He died on June 29, 1941, at the age of 80, still fighting to alleviate the sufferings of the Polish people.

Paderewski's body has temporarily been buried in the National Cemetery at Arlington. It is an honor indeed for Americans to guard the grave of this Polish musician, patriot, and statesman who won the admiration of not only his countrymen but also the lovers of freedom the world over. I pray, along with all Poles, that the day will not be too

distant when Poland will be free again and Paderewski's body will be returned to his native soil which he loved and served so devotedly.

SPECIAL ORDER TRANSFERRED

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order granted the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] for today be transferred to Thursday, July 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

AUTHORITY TO RECEIVE MESSAGES AND SIGN BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS DURING RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until Monday next, the Clerk may be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PEACETIME APPLICATION OF THE ATOM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have just introduced a bill which was favorably reported today by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. As is our custom, a member of the joint committee from each body of the Congress is introducing simultaneously the same bill. This bill will provide for the acceleration of our civilian atomic power reactor program.

In 1954 the Congress passed a basic revision of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946. The objective, as stated at that time, by the proponents of the bill was to increase the peacetime application of the atom, and as part of that peacetime application it was hoped that private enterprise would initiate a vigorous program in the field of construction of atomic reactors for the purpose of producing electrical energy.

At that time I expressed my doubts that the technology of the industry had advanced to the point where private industry could or would accept the financial responsibility of developing successful economic power reactors. I stated, at that time, that the reactor technology was in its infancy; that a great deal of money would have to be expended before electrical energy could be produced by fission on an economical basis. I also stated that if we were to progress in

the art it would be necessary for the Government to expend public funds for some time to come. The evidence of the intervening years has proven my statements to be correct. Private industry has not been able to finance the investment which has been needed to do the experimental work necessary to attain the objective of economic kilowatts.

Our progress has been slow and faltering. I do not blame private industry altogether for this situation. Some blame could be attached to either their gullibility or their overenthusiasm, as expressed by various witnesses during our hearings on the 1954 act.

The fact remains that privately financed efforts have been completely inadequate and 2 years have been lost in the international race to produce economic electrical energy by fission.

Excuses which may be offered for past performances, or glittering promises of future action cannot, at this time, be seriously considered. Our main objective, at this time, is to promote a rapid development of atomic power reactors. It is my opinion today, as it was in 1954, that the Government must accept this responsibility or fall behind the Soviet Union and England in the race.

For these reasons and many others which I have not the time today to express, I have introduced a bill which authorizes and directs the Atomic Energy Commission to accelerate the atomic-power program by building large scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities which are to be designed to demonstrate the practical value of the production of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

These reactors are to be built at existing atomic-energy sites and the power used in Government atomic-energy facilities. This power will undoubtedly be intermittent in its delivery and will also undoubtedly still be above the present cost of conventional electrical energy now being used in these facilities. The public versus private power controversy will not be involved as power will not be offered for sale to nongovernmental distributing groups. The reactors will be built for the purpose of taking a necessary step toward our goal of producing economic power so as to hasten the day when electrical energy can be produced by the fission of the atom at a price which we hope will be as cheap or cheaper than the cost of conventional power today.

Mr. Speaker, I realize it is late in the second session of the 84th Congress, but I hope that this bill may be considered before the present Congress adjourns so that we may not be left behind in the race to achieve leadership in this very important field.

Economic power will, in my opinion, someday be produced. The question facing us today is will the United States, who first developed atomic energy, preserve its leadership in the peacetime application of atomic energy in the power field or shall we take second or third place to England or the Soviet Union.

H. R. 12061

A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Atomic Power Acceleration Amendment of 1956.

SEC. 2. The Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by redesignating chapter 19 as chapter 20, and inserting a new chapter 19 reading as follows:

"CHAPTER 19. Accelerated atomic power program

"SEC. 241. Purpose and policy:

a. It is the purpose of the United States and of this chapter:

(1) To encourage the continued development of atomic power technology and the advancement of the art through practical experience in the development and operation of prototype atomic powerplants;

(2) To achieve economic atomic power as rapidly as practicable;

(3) To advance the spirit of the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the atoms-for-peace plan.

b. (1) In order to carry out the purposes of this chapter, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to accelerate the civilian atomic power program and maintain leadership in atomic power technology by the construction of additional demonstration prototype reactors for domestic use and foreign applications at the maximum possible rate consistent with the status of the development of the art;

(2) The accelerated program authorized by this chapter shall be carried out under the provisions of section 31, and shall be supplementary to other reactor development programs and projects authorized under this act, including sections 31 and 104.

SEC. 242. In order to implement the policy established in section 241, the Commission is authorized and directed as follows:

a. Accelerated power reactor program:

(1) The Commission is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of large-scale prototype power reactor demonstration facilities designed to demonstrate the practical value of utilization facilities for the generation of electric energy in industrial or commercial quantities.

(2) The selection of design for such reactor facilities shall be made on the basis of a determination that development, construction, and operation of a facility so designed offers promise of making a contribution to the advance of the art and technology of the large-scale production of atomic power in the form of electricity in commercial or industrial quantities.

(3) The power reactor demonstration facilities authorized by this subsection shall be constructed at sites of major production facilities operated by or on behalf of the Commission, and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such production facility.

b. Advanced design and development program:

(1) The Commission shall proceed with the development of reactor designs which involve, in concept and approach, significant and promising advances in reactor technology.

(2) As soon as practicable, consistent with the development of appropriate designs, the Commission is authorized and directed to proceed with the construction under contract of prototype power reactors utilizing such advanced concepts, such reactors to be capable of producing not to exceed 50,000 kilowatts of electricity.

c. Foreign atomic power assistance:

In order effectively to carry out the atoms-for-peace plan of the United States, the Commission shall have responsibility for the

conduct of a vigorous program of international cooperation and assistance in the design, construction, and operation of power reactors and related matters. The planning and execution of such a program shall be undertaken as rapidly as practicable.

d. Supporting facilities:

The Commission is authorized to construct, own, and operate supporting facilities necessary in connection with projects initiated under subsections a, b, and c of this section.

e. Quarterly report:

The Commission shall report to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy quarterly beginning January 1, 1957, on the program under the acceleration program.

SEC. 3. Chapter 19 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, is redesignated as chapter 20 and sections 241 and 251 of this act are redesignated respectively as sections 251 and 252, making appropriate amendment to the table of contents.

SEC. 4. Public Law 506, 84th Congress, 2d session, as amended, is amended as follows:

(a) By striking the figure "\$319,595,000" in section 101 thereof and inserting the figure "\$719,595,000."

(b) By adding at the end of section 101 (c) thereof a new subsection reading:

"11. Project 57-c-11, civilian atomic power acceleration program, \$400,000,000."

IS THE AMERICAN TEXTILE INDUSTRY EXPENDABLE?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ALEXANDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Since 1945, we have spent nearly \$55 billion in foreign aid.

Whether this vast outpouring of our resources has accomplished its intended result is debatable. Some say that, without these expenditures, communism would have taken over in France, Italy, and much of the rest of Europe and the world.

Others—and I am proud to include myself among them—believe that it is impossible to buy reliable friends and allies and keep them bought.

We do not believe that our Government should further dissipate the Nation's resources in impractical and impossible efforts to raise the living standards of vast segments of the world's ever-increasing population. We believe such ill-considered efforts are foredoomed to failure and will actually make more enemies than friends by raising false hopes.

However, the wisdom or unwisdom of foreign aid is not the issue here involved.

The issue—and I suggest that it is already of acute urgency—is whether, if we are to have a foreign aid program, it should be paid by all the taxpayers or whether certain industries are to be called upon to bear an extra and disproportionate share of the burden.

Up to now, we have never deliberately destroyed any important American industry in pursuit of our foreign aid policy. We have hurt some. We have put them deeply in debt and have taxed them at astronomically high levels.

But up to now, we have stopped short of throwing the American market wide open to the sort of foreign competition which now threatens a long list of our most vital industries.

The textile industry is a case in point.

In 1951, Japanese textile imports into this country aggregated only 744,000 yards.

By 1953, these imports had risen to 29,760,000 yards.

The 1954 figure was 47 million yards and 1955 imports more than doubled the imports of 1954, reaching a high last year of nearly 100 million yards.

And if we add to this the yardage brought into this country in the form of finished apparel, the total for 1955 was equivalent to more than 250 million yards.

Coming on to the current year, importations for January 1956 were more than 400 percent greater than for January 1955, while, on the basis of imports for January, February, and March, the first quarter, total imports for the year will run to roughly half a billion yards.

Nor is this all. The Japanese imports are not distributed evenly over the whole United States market. Instead, they are picking off certain segments or products of the industry and destroying them.

Thus the Japanese have already captured 70 percent of our velveteen market. In 1955 they shipped us 5,754,000 square yards. At that time the total production of velveteen was 7,308,000. This unexpected influx resulted in the closing of practically all the velveteen mills in the United States.

In the case of gingham and blouses, the Japs have already taken over 30 percent of our market.

Thus the sinister pattern emerges: Pick off one segment or product at a time until they have the entire United States market, and the United States industry is destroyed.

How do they do this? Why cannot the American mills meet this competition?

The answer is simple.

Labor costs and raw-cotton costs account for 80 percent of the total cost of production.

The Japanese pay their textile mill labor 13 cents an hour as compared with an average of \$1.35 in this country.

They buy their cotton—under our two-price system—at from 8 to 10 cents less per pound than our mills have to pay for it.

And as if this were not enough, they have a brand new, highly modern plant and equipment which we gave them. In other words, we handed them the knife with which to cut our throat.

The result?

United States mills have been forced to curtail production, shorten the work-week, and discharge temporarily or permanently 260,000 employees.

As one mill operator in South Carolina recently put it, "We have always been able to meet competition without tears. But we can't lick the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Organization for Trade Cooperation, and the \$64 billion give-away program while Congress twists our arm."

I repeat:

For the first time, key industries—industries vital to the national defense—are regarded by this administration as expendable—at least in substantial part.

For the first time, we have a policy which places the burden of foreign aid, not on the taxpayers generally, but on a selected group of industries which have been marked for the sacrifice.

And for the first time, we are deliberately and with full knowledge of the consequences importing unemployment and reducing the American standard of living.

What is being done to remedy the textile import problem?

Along with congressional leaders and others, I have personally appealed to the President and sought the assistance of the Secretary of State and Secretary of Agriculture to negotiate trade limitation agreements with Japan in an effort to establish import controls of textiles as authorized under the present law.

All of these efforts have been in vain.

An effort is being made in the Congress requiring the use of the emergency authority of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 to establish limitations on the imports of cotton textiles to a level not to exceed the past 5 years' average. This proposed legislation makes no fundamental changes in the prescribed procedure for the determination of the facts by the Tariff Commission. Neither does it limit the authority of the President to decide ultimately whether quantitative limitations should be imposed. It merely temporarily controls imports to keep an already serious situation from getting further out of hand and provides time to find a solution for this problem. I shall vigorously support this proposed legislation.

POLICY ON GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS TO INDUSTRIES IN TARGET AREAS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of Congress from the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan, I was appalled to read in today's newspaper a statement by Mr. Victor Roterus, Director of the Office of Area Development, that no Government contracts would be given to new industries locating within some 50 cities which are prime atom and hydrogen bomb targets. According to him, defense contracts would be withheld from new industries establishing themselves as far as 25 or 30 miles from such areas.

According to reporters present, Mr. Roterus extended the policy to include withholding of fast tax writeoffs, and Government financing, of such new facilities, as well as other Government stimuli to new industry.

Now let us analyze this situation. Each of the fifty-odd cities affected is told that no new defense industry can move into their area, because if it be so foolish as to build there, no Government defense work will be given.

And, I repeat this, new business cannot come into areas where it knows that Government contracts will not be given.

In effect, these areas are absolutely precluded from participation in new business with the largest single customer in the world.

Now who is affected? Mr. Roterus mentions Washington, D. C., and Baltimore. Certainly included are New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, and my own city of Detroit. Each of the Members of this House can determine whether the fifty-odd cities alluded to by the Director of Area Development is or is not included in such a blanket withholding of new business and new contracts.

Now, let us look at the effect on my own area of Detroit. Michigan has now 220,000 unemployed, of whom 138,000 reside in the Detroit area. Percentage-wise 7.8 percent of the work force in the Michigan area are out of work, and 9.1 percent are unemployed in Detroit.

These figures which I have cited do not mention the great number of people who are working 1 or 2 days a week, or less, who are not technically unemployed, but have almost the same hardship. Further, they are based upon those drawing unemployment compensation, and do not make allowance for those who are not covered by unemployment compensation, and for whom no statistics are readily available. These people are coldly told no possibility of new defense work is open to them.

The Government has gone so far as to declare that the Detroit area is one of substantial labor surplus, and is channeling certain extra defense contracts into the area, and offering certain other helps to our economy. And now this blow to our people.

I have taken the matter up with the Secretary of Commerce, asking for an explanation and for revocation of the statement.

If we have all the peace and prosperity which the administration would have us believe in their blatant campaign announcements such a policy is not necessary. If we are so close to war as to justify such a proposal, the people must be informed of it.

I hope my colleagues will join me in attempting to put a stop to such a ruthless policy of discrimination against our large cities, unless the need be desperate.

While I have no quarrel with dispersal of industry, it must not where necessary to defense be done in so sudden a way as this unless danger of war is imminent, particularly in view of the hardship to millions which will certainly follow.

To summarize my position, Mr. Speaker, I demand that the administration revoke the statement, and that the policy to which it alludes be revoked so as not to cause further hardship in areas like Detroit and other large cities.

NARCOTIC CONTROL ACT OF 1956

Mr. BOGGS submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 11619) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotics Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana and for other purposes.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. DINGELL, for 20 minutes, today.

Mr. MASON (at the request of Mr. McConnell), for 5 minutes, on Monday, July 2.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and to include certain quotations and extraneous matter.

Mr. PRICE.

Mr. METCALF, the remarks he made in the Committee of the Whole, and to include three newspaper articles, and a memorandum of the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska (at the request of Mr. McConnell).

Mr. CRAMER (at the request of Mr. McConnell).

Mr. KRUEGER (at the request of Mr. McConnell) and to include an article.

Mr. ROOSEVELT (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), his remarks today in Committee of the Whole and to include certain tables and extraneous matter.

Mr. DODD.

Mr. REUSS.

Mr. EBERHARTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MOSS.

Mr. FLOOD (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) and to include extraneous matter.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9952. An act to provide a lump-sum readjustment payment for members of the reserve components who are involuntarily released from active duty; and

H. R. 10986. An act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1957, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7763. An act to amend the Japanese-American Evacuation Claims Act of 1948, as amended, to expedite the final determination of the claims, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9852. An act to extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 10872. An act to provide for extension of the time during which annual assessment work on unpatented mining claims validated under section 2 of the Act of August 11, 1955 may be made, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 2, 1956, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2019. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the retirement of members of the Metropolitan Police Department of the District of Columbia and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2020. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a proposed concession contract with Edgar G. Wellman, doing business as Wellman Enterprises, which, when executed by the Superintendent, Glacier National Park, Mont., will authorize him to operate a saddle and pack horse transportation service in Glacier National Park for a period of 5 years from January 1, 1956, pursuant to the act of July 31, 1953 (67 Stat. 271); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2021. A letter from the Director, Legislative Programs, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954"; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

2022. A letter from the Presidential Adviser on Personnel Management, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to consolidate and revise certain provisions of law relating to additional compensation of civilian employees of the Federal Government stationed in foreign areas and to facilitate recruitment, reduce turnover, and compensate for extra costs and hardships due to overseas assignments"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2023. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to encourage the extension and improvement of voluntary health prepayment plans or policies"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2024. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act entitled 'An

act to create a Recreation Board for the District of Columbia, to define its duties, and for other purposes,' approved April 29, 1942"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2025. A letter from the Acting Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on records proposed for disposal and lists or schedules covering records proposed for disposal by certain Government agencies, pursuant to the act approved July 7, 1943 (57 Stat. 380), as amended by the act approved July 6, 1945 (59 Stat. 434); to the Committee on House Administration.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACK of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 8902. A bill to amend subsection 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. PRICE: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. H. R. 12050. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2531). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 9904. A bill to provide vocational training for adult Indians; without amendment (Rept. No. 2532). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11449. A bill to amend section 69 of the Hawaiian Organic Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2533). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 11696. A bill to authorize the conveyance of homestead allotments to Indians, Aleuts, or Eskimos in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2534). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 11787. A bill to amend further and make permanent the Missing Persons Act, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2535). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 609. A bill to amend the Federal Import Milk Act, approved February 15, 1927 (44 Stat. 1101, 21 U. S. C. Annotated, 141-149); with amendment (Rept. No. 2536). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 2092. An act transferring to the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army the bridge across the Missouri River between the Fort Leavenworth military reservation in Kansas and Platte County, Mo., and authorizing its removal; without amendment (Rept. No. 2538). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BROOKS of Louisiana: Committee on Armed Services. S. 1135. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to establish Civil Air Patrol as a civilian auxiliary of the United States Air Force and to authorize the Secretary of the Air Force to extend aid to Civil Air Patrol in the fulfillment of its objectives, and for other purposes"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2539). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HARRIS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 1456. An act to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2540). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLE: Committee on Armed Services. H. R. 9419. A bill to authorize the disposal of the U. S. S. *Hartford*, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2541). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4719. A bill to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Hells Canyon Dam on the Snake River between Idaho and Oregon, and for related purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2542). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 11811. A bill to alleviate conditions of excessive unemployment and underemployment in depressed industrial and rural areas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2543). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. H. R. 11861. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing Federal participation in the cost of protecting the shores of publicly owned property," approved August 13, 1946; without amendment (Rept. No. 2544). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant, Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 613. Joint resolution to authorize the vessel operations revolving fund of the Department of Commerce to be used for expenses in connection with the chartering of merchant ships under jurisdiction of the Secretary of Commerce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOGGS: Committee of conference. H. R. 11619. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and the Narcotic Drugs Import and Export Act to provide for a more effective control of narcotic drugs and marihuana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2546). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. KING of California: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 10269. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to place metallurgical grade alumina on the free list; with amendment (Rept. No. 2547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 449. An act for the relief of George Pantelas; without amendment (Rept. No. 2537). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 12050. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. R. 12051. A bill to authorize the erection of a memorial in the Badlands National Monument in honor of Peter Norbeck, Paul E. Bellamy, Sr., and Ben Millard; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H. R. 12052. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930, to allow credit for certain service rendered States or instrumentalities thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12053. A bill to provide for the reorganization of the safety functions of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H. R. 12054. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MOSS:

H. R. 12055. A bill to establish a system for the classification and compensation of scientific and professional positions in the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 12056. A bill relating to the amount deductible for income-tax purposes in the case of losses of commercial fruit and nut trees in a major disaster; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee:

H. R. 12057. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lands in Shiloh National Military Park to the State of Tennessee for the relocation of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. R. 12058. A bill to amend section 403 of title IV of the National Housing Act affecting insurance of savings and loan accounts and to amend section 5 (1) of Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended, affecting Federal savings and loan associations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H. R. 12059. A bill to determine the rights and interests of the Navaho Tribe, Hopi Tribe, and individual Indians to the area set aside by the Executive order of December 6, 1882, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H. R. 12060. A bill to provide for decorative art in Federal buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 12061. A bill providing for a civilian atomic power acceleration program; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. R. 12062. A bill to require certain safety devices on household refrigerators shipped in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. REUSS:

H. R. 12063. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code so as to prohibit the misuse by collecting agencies of names, emblems, and insignia to indicate Federal agency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. R. 12064. A bill to increase the rates of disability and death compensation and additional allowances for dependents payable to veterans and their dependents; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUMULTY:

H. R. 12065. A bill to amend the law in force with respect to the display and use of the flag of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

H. J. Res. 668. Joint resolution to urge the creation of an International Juridical Commission within the framework of the North

Atlantic Treaty Organization in order to document the crimes against humanity committed by the international Communist conspiracy and to reduce the dangers of world war III; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DORN of New York:

H. J. Res. 669. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the further protection of certain basic rights of citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H. J. Res. 670. Joint resolution to authorize participation by the United States in the 1959 Pan-American games to be held in Cleveland, Ohio; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT of Florida:

H. Con. Res. 259. Concurrent resolution providing for the drafting of legislation for combat pay and recognizing the importance of the frontline fighting forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. IKARD:

H. Con. Res. 260. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 232, 84th Congress, entitled "The Capitol in Story and Pictures"; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. R. 12066. A bill for the relief of John M. Dean; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H. R. 12067. A bill for the relief of Chong Gee Yueng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARDY:

H. R. 12068. A bill for the relief of Irmgard Glancy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS of Ohio:

H. R. 12069. A bill for the relief of Peter Nyktas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. R. 12070. A bill for the relief of Hideo Ono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING:

H. R. 12071. A bill for the relief of Elise Delree; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIEMINSKI:

H. R. 12072. A bill for the relief of Raffaele D'Auria; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. R. 12073. A bill for the relief of William C. Brady and Joyce Brady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1172. By Mr. FORAND: Petition of Mary M. Eldridge, legislative director of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Rhode Island, Inc., and 69 others from Rhode Island, urging enactment of legislation to remove alcoholic-beverage advertising from the air and out of the channels of interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1173. By Mr. NORBLAD: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. Christian Arnesen and 15 other citizens of Clackamas County, Ore., urging the passage of legislation to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1174. Also, petition of Mrs. Ralph Nordlund and 56 other citizens of Washington County, Ore., urging the passage of legisla-

tion to prohibit the transportation of alcoholic-beverage advertising in interstate commerce, and its broadcasting over the air; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1175. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Mrs. Cecile Kennedy, president of Evergreen

WCTU, Sanilac County, Mich., residing in Cass City, Mich., and 32 others, of Cass City and Decker, Mich., in favor of S. 923 and H. R. 4627, bills to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages in interstate commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1176. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the chairman, Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, New York, N. Y., requesting that Dr. Clark Foreman, director of the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee, not be cited for contempt by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Capt. Chester McPherson Anderson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege, as a result of my affiliation with the United States Coast Guard, to have become acquainted with one of its unsung heroes.

Capt. Chester M. Anderson retires from the United States Coast Guard service tomorrow, June 30, 1956, after 32 years of loyal, efficient, and distinguished service.

Captain Anderson was born in Seattle, Wash., in 1894. He received his primary education in that city's schools and later attended the DeKoven Military School and the Navigation School of the University of Washington.

During World War I he served on active duty as a lieutenant, junior grade, with the United States Naval Reserve. He entered that service in October 1918 and was honorably discharged therefrom in September 1921. He continued to follow the sea until 1924 when he was commissioned as an ensign in the United States Coast Guard.

During World War II he was the commanding officer of the cutter *Algonquin*, assigned to the North Atlantic. His fine service is only partly recognized by the awards from our Government to him which consist of, among others, the Navy Commendation Ribbon for convoy escort operations in the North Atlantic during World War II, the American Defense Service Ribbon with Sea Clasp, the American Area Ribbon, the European-African-Middle Eastern Area Ribbon, the Asiatic-Pacific Ribbon, and the World War I and World War II Victory Medals.

During the last 4 years he has served as Director of the United States Coast Guard Auxiliary where he has done an exceptionally outstanding job. He systematized their procedures, he minimized and standardized the forms they use, he assisted with their new manuals, encouraged the enrollment of new men, and aided considerably in increasing the present roster of the northern area to well over 2,000 men and women.

He is loved and respected by all, particularly because of the way he extended himself beyond the call of regular duty.

I know that every Auxiliarist joins me in saluting him and wishing him well in all that he undertakes in the years ahead.

**The 15th Anniversary of the Death of
Ignace Jan Paderewski**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, June 30, will mark the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, Polish composer and pianist, statesman and a foremost champion of freedom and democratic ideals. This is a most appropriate occasion to remember not only the profound works of the immortal Paderewski, but also to extend our sympathy to the millions of Polish-Americans in the United States and the Poles throughout the world who have been persecuted for their belief in the same ideals for which Paderewski fought so hard.

Paderewski was born in Poland in the year 1860, and at a very early age made manifest his great talents in music. As he continued his career as an artist and composer, he received increasing acclaim throughout the world, and in 1891 made his first American appearance at a recital in New York City. This, of course, was only the beginning of a career in this country that was to bring him closer to the heart of every American.

But Paderewski's contributions in the field of music were not his only ones—not by any means. He received innumerable honors for his statesmanship and to thousands of people he is still a symbol of liberty. It is significant to note in this centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson that it was largely due to Paderewski that the 13th of Wilson's Fourteen Points was devoted to the restoration of a free and independent Poland. After the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination, Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919.

We all remember with sadness that the freedom gained by Poland after the First World War was short lived and the land of Poland was again taken over by a totalitarian aggressor. But the independent spirit of the Poles still prevails today and I am sure that none of the Polish people will ever forget the last words of Paderewski, which were "Poland will rise again."

This could not be manifest more clearly than by the protest of the Polish workers yesterday against the dominat-

ing rule of the Communists when thousands of Polish workers revolted against their undemocratic rulers.

**Amend Section 165 (b) of the Internal
Revenue Code**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 165 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code relating to the amount deductible for income tax purposes in the case of losses of commercial fruit and nut trees in a major disaster.

As a direct result of widespread floods in December 1955 and January 1956 in northern California and elsewhere in the Nation, hundreds of commercial fruit and nut growers were virtually rendered destitute by the destruction of their fruit and nut trees.

The problem of the orchardist who suffers a loss to his trees is more serious than that of the farmer losing a crop as a result of flood. The orchardist who loses his trees must wait a minimum of 4 or 5 years in order to grow new ones during which time his source of income is destroyed; the farmer may produce a bumper crop in the next growing season.

The method of planting orchards, and growing and cultivating the trees does not lend itself to a practical solution of capitalizing costs, as the Bureau of Internal Revenue terms it. Most nut or fruit growers are single operators. Orchards are planted periodically in small blocks, with the grower doing his own work, and naturally there are very few costs to capitalize even if it were practical to do so. For this simple but cogent reason, it is far more equitable and sound to measure the grower's loss by fair market values, rather than by the Bureau of Internal Revenue's "cost approach" method.

In other words, the fair market approach measures the real loss suffered. Current provisions of the Revenue Code are such that with this real loss provided, the grower could get some relief of his taxes when it is most sorely needed.

As things are today, we have the paradoxical situation of growers being completely wiped out of homes, and livelihoods, although still faced with a staggering tax burden. This situation cries out for remedy in major flood disaster areas of the Nation.

Foreign Aid Does Not Pay OffEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. OTTO KRUEGER**

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. KRUEGER. Mr. Speaker, while the Senate Foreign Affairs Committee proceeds to restore the foreign aid funds cut by the House, there is a growing feeling over the Nation that we should tighten up on this aid to the whole world. If this sentiment thrives there may be trouble when the appropriation bill for this so-called mutual security comes up.

It is likely that the Senate will follow the recommendation of the committee and restore \$715 million of the \$1.1 billion cut that the House made when that body considered the mutual security authorization. The Senate has always been rather generous where the State Department was concerned.

There has been no change in the foreign aid situation. It looks like the same silly business that we have indulged in for years, this attempt to buy friends. We look ridiculous when we have to be so careful how we beg some of these nations to accept our cash. They will take our money and then tell us that we should drop all barriers against Red China and recognize the international outlaws that still hold our citizens as prisoners.

This is the type of cooperation that our billions have bought. The American taxpayer is asked to dig up more billions to continue the deal. In the House last week, before passing it, we debated and argued on a pension bill for our veterans. The costs of the measure were brought up time and again, and there were some touching words about the expense that the country would have to face.

We should spend what is proper to care for those veterans who suffer from service-connected disability, or those veterans who are past their productive years. If we have so much money that we can spend it overseas, I would like to cut that out and put some of it into circulation here at home. Certainly our veterans should merit as much consideration as Tito or Nehru.

These spending plans, once they are started, never seem to end. Back in 1945 we were to have the Marshall plan in operation for 4½ years and it was to cost only \$11 billion. We still have the foreign aid going in 1956, and the authorizations from July 1, 1945, to June 30, 1957, if the Senate committee figures are retained, will amount to \$72,154,816,750.

We are told that this is smart spending; that it has halted the spread of communism. From 1945, when this program began, Soviet Russia has brought 5 million square miles of territory under its control, and more than 700 million free people suffer oppression and slavery that come with the Red flag. I would say that such a program has failed dismally. The idea sounded good, but it did not make friends. You have to earn their respect and cooperation.

We know that these billions have not checked communism. Congress cannot find out how the money is being spent. We are told much of it goes for military purposes and that is a secret. The General Accounting Office is supposed to be the watchdog, but it makes little progress in running down the way the money goes. GAO says that the foreign-aid program suffers from "poor planning, lack of accountability, poor coordination, overestimating the capabilities of recipient countries, and overambitious programing."

If it should come to pass that Congress would refuse to appropriate the money which has been authorized for this year, the foreign aid could go rolling right along for quite a while with the money still on hand. The request was for \$4.9 billion for this year. During the recent debate on the bill, Congress did find out that there was \$6.8 billion still on hand. This was money that had been appropriated and was not spent. The spenders got the money faster than the countries could spend it.

Many people seem concerned about the growing idea that our Government can provide money for all of us in any circumstance or any condition; that all we have to do is ask for it. When we review the billions that have been spent abroad on these questionable programs, then I cannot see how anyone can take issue with Government spending here at home.

Spirit of Independence Inspired by Paderewski Burns Anew in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of the 15th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski—so well known in America that we considered him one of us—it is encouraging and gratifying to witness the rekindling of the fire of liberty and freedom so well fed by him through his lifetime.

The inspiration Paderewski gave the Polish people is still nurtured in their hearts and the smoldering embers of their national patriotism today are bursting into full flame—threatening to engulf the Communist tyrants who have enslaved their Christian land for the past decade. In these efforts the Polish people have the sincere support of the entire free world. Here in the United States the prayers of millions are with them in their struggle.

Paderewski, world-renowned composer and pianist, became the first Premier of the Polish Republic in 1919 after the people of Poland asserted their independence according to the principle of national self-determination embodied in the famous Fourteen Points promulgated by President Woodrow Wilson. It was most fitting that this new blow for liberty

being struck by Polish patriots should come on the 15th anniversary of Paderewski's death.

Jan PaderewskiEXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**HON. THOMAS J. DODD**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, today, June 29, is the 15th anniversary of the death of one of the world's truly great figures—Jan Paderewski, statesman, musician, and patriot. It is also the centennial year of the birth of Woodrow Wilson, who did so much to further the cause of a free Poland. The lives of these two leaders touched at many points; both were passionate advocates of the principle of national self-determination, and both dedicated their lives to their respective countries.

It is ironic to read in today's headlines of the revolt against Red troops in the Polish city of Poznan. For it was in this historic city that Jan Paderewski dedicated a statue to Woodrow Wilson after the end of World War I. Paderewski wished to commemorate America's friendship to the new Polish Republic by honoring our wartime President. Perhaps this one incident illustrates the difference between the United States and the Soviet Union. The Poles honor a statue of one of America's greatest leaders in Poznan, while for Communist Russia they have nothing but hatred and armed resistance to her troops.

It has been said that all humanity pays tribute to genius, and the genius of Jan Paderewski brought esthetic pleasure to millions. But his career has an even greater significance. He was an outstanding leader in world affairs, and an articulate spokesman for his homeland.

Paderewski was born in the Province of Podolia, then a part of Czarist Russia, in 1860. From relatively obscure origin, he rose to become the Premier of Poland and an almost legendary figure in the world of music. Paderewski's father played an important role in the uprising against Russia in 1863. For his struggle against Russian tyranny the elder Paderewski was banished to Siberia when his son was less than 3 years old. The great musician probably inherited his lifelong hatred of oppression from his father, who was an active leader in the cause of liberty.

Jan Paderewski was a man of deep and sincere humility. On his 75th birthday, in 1935, he asked the people of Poland not to be "bothered" to commemorate the occasion, but nevertheless hundreds of thousands of people throughout the world sent their grateful thoughts to him, even if they were not always recorded. For this man had contributed not only his talent, but his fortune, to the cause of freedom. It was his lifelong wish to see a free and happy Poland before he died.

The signing of the armistice after the First World War gave Paderewski the

opportunity to return to his homeland. Czarist Russia had fallen, Germany defeated, and all Europe was in a state of chaos. The time had come to press Poland's claim to freedom from foreign domination. On June 28, 1919, Paderewski accepted the task of forming a coalition government, in which he held the dual posts of Premier and Foreign Minister. His genius as a statesman became apparent when, with freedom in sight, Poland was torn with internal strife. There were numerous factions, each fighting for political control of Poland, and it was his duty to bring a measure of peace to his homeland.

Paderewski became a world figure at the Versailles Peace Conference, where he ably represented his country. He argued for Polish territorial claims on the basis of the principles set forth in President Wilson's Fourteen Points. The result of his negotiations was the establishment of the Polish Corridor, with Danzig as a free city of Europe. Paderewski obtained German and Austrian recognition of the new Poland and achieved a friendly relationship with Czechoslovakia, Latvia, and other European nations born of the war. Paderewski eventually resigned as Premier of Poland and came to the United States, where he began a series of concerts that added to his world fame.

Paderewski's generosity, almost to the point of folly, has become well known throughout the world. He gave vast sums of money to help relieve the suffering of the people of Europe during World War I, and turned over his great estate on Lake Geneva, in Switzerland, to victims of the war. It has been said that before leaving Europe for the United States in 1930, he had given away most of his fortune. The true extent of his generosity, both in spirit and money, will never be known.

Americans, and indeed all the people of the free world, will never forget the contribution to the cause of freedom made by this musician, patriot and statesman. The prayers of millions for world peace will someday be realized, largely because of the groundwork laid by such giants as Jan Paderewski.

A Tribute to Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, 15 years have passed since the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski and nearly 100 since his birth. Each year his contribution to mankind's welfare shines more brilliantly in the pages of history.

It is appropriate to recall that this year also is the centennial of the birth of another great champion of human liberty, Woodrow Wilson. Wilson and

Paderewski worked together in the common effort for the self-determination and independence of Poland which was achieved after the First World War.

The 20 years of Polish freedom—from 1919 to 1939—were glorious ones. Paderewski was the first Premier of the Polish Republic and his name is inextricably tied to the cause of Polish liberty.

Providence is rarely as generous in her endowments as with Ignace Jan Paderewski. He would have won immortal fame as a composer and artist alone. But linked with his brilliant musical achievements was his dedication to a free Poland. When he died on June 29, 1941, he left a record from which all Poles and all Americans of whatever national origin will find inspiration for generations to come.

Fifteenth Anniversary of Death of Ignace Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1956, is the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Paderewski, the internationally renowned Polish composer, pianist, and patriot who in 1919 became the first Premier of the Polish Republic.

A great portion of the credit for the formation of that Republic has to be attributed to the efforts of Paderewski. Although he had already won world fame with his incomparable piano concerts, this Polish patriot considered the freedom and independence of Poland more important than his musical career. Early in life he said, "The vision of a strong and independent Poland has always been the lodestar of my existence. Its realization is still the great aim of my life."

No one was more aware than Paderewski that the establishment of an independent Poland would be a difficult task. Poland had been partitioned for nearly 150 years by her aggressive neighbors Austria, Prussia, and Russia. There seemed to be little chance that the Polish people could ever be united. However, the outbreak of World War I was to give them that chance.

Paderewski quickly took advantage of this opportunity that arose during the war. He came to the United States to arouse the sympathy of the American people for Polish freedom. He had previously in concert tours in this country won their hearts with his peerless music; he now came to open their hearts for the Polish people in their struggle for independence. In a short period of time he accomplished much. He was successful, through a series of lecture and concert tours, in raising funds for his war-ravaged homeland; he was instrumental

in the recruitment of Polish-American volunteers to serve in the Polish Army already fighting with the Allies in Europe—and perhaps his greatest achievement—he obtained the sympathy of President Wilson for the Polish cause.

President Wilson was always a staunch supporter of the rights of small nations. Through Colonel House, a close friend of Paderewski, consultations were arranged in which this champion of Polish freedom expressed to the President his pleas for his beloved homeland. These meetings formed the foundation upon which the Polish Republic was to be constructed at the Paris Peace Conference. President Wilson was impressed with the devotion of Paderewski to this cause, and assured him that he was confident that one day Poland would be free and united. The famous Fourteen Points that were published soon after these conversations and in which the Chief Executive stated that an independent Poland should be erected, was tangible evidence that Paderewski had succeeded in gaining the support of President Wilson. Paderewski's vision of an independent Poland was almost realized.

This dream became a reality at the Paris Peace Conference. After the war Paderewski returned to Poland and succeeded in uniting the various political factions and in forming a coalition government so that a unified country could formulate plans for the legalization of Polish freedom at Paris. He became premier of the new government and was chosen as chief delegate to the Conference. At Paris he took an active part in the delimitation of Poland's frontiers along much the same borders as discussed with President Wilson during the war. Finally, Paderewski's supreme confidence in a resurrected Poland became an established fact when he signed the Versailles Treaty.

Paderewski had contributed his time, energy, talents, and resources to aid in the establishment of the Polish Republic. Having accomplished the chief aim of his life, in 1921 he retired from public life and returned to his music. In 1939 ill health forced him to abandon his piano concerts.

It was while he was in retirement in Switzerland that his beloved country was once more invaded by Russia and Germany. Quickly, this heroic Polish patriot emerged from his retirement and although aged and fatigued he returned to America to solicit aid for his subjugated country. On January 11, 1940, he accepted the presidency of the exiled Polish Parliament in France.

He died on June 29, 1941, fighting to his last breath for the freedom of his native land.

I would like to take this opportunity on the anniversary of Paderewski's death to again express my concern for Poland and all other enslaved nations which are suffering under Communist tyranny. I am confident that the Polish desire for freedom expressed so nobly by her patriot Paderewski will never be extinguished despite the brutality of the Soviets. May the memory of Paderewski serve to encourage the Poles who are today oppressed by the ruthless Kremlin.

Record of Hon. A. L. Miller on Public Power and Reclamation: The Truth of the Story

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, a misstatement, if repeated often enough and by persons in authoritative positions, can inevitably acquire the appearance of fact. How many times have we heard the remark "It must be true, so and so said it and he ought to know"; "it must be true, I read it in the paper."

Misappropriations of the truth can come about quite innocently, or false impressions can be created deliberately. In either case, it becomes necessary to set the record straight, and I feel this compulsion now with respect to my record in Congress as it applies to Federal power projects.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], Chairman of the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, by his May 22, 1956, attack upon my voting record and my motives, precipitated a campaign that has been taken up by segments of the New Deal press and Federal power zealots throughout the country. The fact that his intemperate remarks had no foundation in truth does not lessen the vigor of battle, and I suspect that his remark that "Doc MILLER would not vote for the second coming of Christ" may have brought smiles to the faces of the few who follow his line.

There is truth in his statement that I am interested in power and reclamation development for Nebraska. I want my State to progress. I have authored legislation that created the Ainsworth project, the Sargent project, the Farwell project, the Mirage Flats project, the Lavaca Flats, O'Neill and Mirage Flats extension units; I have actively supported the Salt-Wahoo, the Frenchman-Cambridge, the Bostwick, and other irrigation and flood control developments in our State. I have also supported projects adjacent to Nebraska that have enhanced the growth of irrigation and electrical power for the people of these neighboring States as well as my own, such as Kendrick, Alcova and Glendo in Wyoming, and all of the outstanding projects in the seven-State Missouri River Basin.

During the 14 years I have been a Member of Congress I have supported at least 371 reclamation, hydroelectric, and flood-control projects that have passed the House. These acts authorized construction of works throughout the United States; the Chief Joseph project in Washington, Trinity, Ventura, and the Central Valley in California, the Washita in Oklahoma, Weber Basin in Utah, and the upper Colorado. I have voted for steam plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority, irrigation and power in Bonneville, dams and transmission facilities in the Southwestern Power Au-

thority, and many others. My interest is not confined to Nebraska alone. Quite obviously, it is nationwide.

In 1952, President Truman declared a moratorium on new reclamation and power projects starts and when this order went into effect, I addressed the House as follows:

It comes to my attention that no new starts have been before the Congress and the administration for some time; and if this program continues, the present irrigation projects will have been finished and we will be without a new start for irrigation. I earnestly hope that the policy of the Government and the Committee on Appropriations will be changed so that we can proceed with the orderly development of feasible irrigation and electric-power projects.

This, you will recall, was a Democratic administration and a Democratic Congress.

In 1955, it was my amendment, offered on the floor of the House, that increased the appropriations bill \$32 million so there would be money for 8 new irrigation and power projects that had been deleted by the Democrat-controlled House Appropriations Committee.

Now, if my critics who have branded me as being anti-public-power had examined the record I am sure they honestly could not have issued these statements. I have supported the REA's and the rural telephone in Nebraska, and in the Nation at large.

At the same time, I have been concerned about economy in Government, and it was for this reason that I voted, with the majority of the Democratic 82d Congress, to trim the appropriations for power and reclamation projects for 1 year when we were experiencing adverse fortunes in the Korean war. The Government's current operating budget at that time was in the red by \$14 billion, and the 5-percent cut I supported was certainly in order. The Democratic Party, described by some as the patron saint of public power, must not have felt that this action was intended to destroy public power because the majority vote was with the Nebraska delegation.

In recent days I have been told that I cannot qualify as a public-power supporter because I did not vote to build a high Federal dam in Hells Canyon when this bill was before the House Interior Committee. However, the issue is not that simple. It can be understood by a sketch of the factual background of this legislation. The Hells Canyon bill has been introduced in at least four different Congresses—the Democratic 81st, the Democratic 82d, the Republican 83d, and the Democratic 84th. In 1950 it died silently in the Senate. On June 18, 1952, it was killed by unanimous vote in the House Interior Committee, when the Democratic members controlled the committee by a 15-to-13 majority. It was again introduced and referred to the committee of which I was chairman in the 83d Congress, but the sponsor of the bill did not request a hearing, and no attempt was made to press the bill forward. When Hells Canyon legislation was before the subcommittee of the House Interior Committee last year the Democrats walked out of the committee

room to defeat a quorum call on a motion to indefinitely postpone action on the bill; but they did not again bring up the bill until Paul Butler, chairman of their national committee, ordered that it be done because of its importance to the reelection of the senior Member of the other body from Oregon, and Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, from the same State.

This, considered together with the fact that Idaho Power Co.'s three-dam proposal will cost less than half and produce 98 percent as much power as the Federal high dam, makes it obvious that the Hells Canyon issue is intensely political and nothing more.

I am sure that you, in fair-mindedness, will understand that there are two sides to this looking-glass. I could easily accuse Mr. KIRWAN of being against public power, because he admittedly killed the Fort Randall-Grand Island 230-kilovolt line. No better opportunity to prove his advocacy of public power could be presented to him, and the excuse he made to explain his opposition was indeed flimsy.

It is my hope that these decisions will be considered in the light of the welfare of our country, with intellectual honesty, and in the spirit of fairness toward the people upon whom these responsibilities rest.

Ignace Jan Paderewski—The 15th Anniversary of the Death of Ignace Jan Paderewski

**EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF**

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski, famed Polish musician, humanitarian, and statesman. Paderewski certainly deserves the laudation being accorded him for his untiring efforts and devotion to duty in helping restore the integrity and liberty of the great nation of Poland. Poland, long torn apart by internal insurrections and by external aggression of powerful neighbors, was given a new chance for national survival largely by the courage and energy of this one man, Ignace Jan Paderewski. He felt that an independent Poland, which had once played a major role in central Europe, was still needed there. Paderewski himself said:

The need of Poland is an integral part of the need of the world. Totalitarianism must be defeated and liberty and self-government restored. Until that is accomplished the rest is idle talk.

The history of Poland is familiar to us all. This history, often one of national frustration, defeat, and international strife, also has had many glorious chapters. The greatest opportunity, however, for Polish patriots to realize the restoration of Poland as an independent country came with World War I.

Many Poles carried their dream for national revival to various parts of the world. Ignace Paderewski was chosen to go to America for this purpose. The reason for choosing him doubtless was that he was better known in the United States—through his musical career—than any other Pole, and he could speak and write English. The selection was a good one, too, for he not only won the sympathy of the American people but also that of President Woodrow Wilson. When Woodrow Wilson went before Congress to deliver his annual message, he mentioned Poland and stressed it should be independent, united, and autonomous. Twelve months later he listed an independent Poland as the thirteenth point of his famous Fourteen Points. The creation of a free and united Poland by the World War I statesmen at Paris was largely due to the great prophet for the movement of Polish freedom, Ignace Paderewski.

The commemoration of the death of Paderewski this year coincidentally comes during the centenary celebration of the birth of Woodrow Wilson. These two men, more than many others of the past generation, held fast to a vision of the kind of healthy international atmosphere, based on faith in justice, righteousness, belief in the common cause of liberty and democracy, that would make the world a better place in which to live. We of this generation could do no better than to follow in the course they laid out.

Remarks on H. R. 12022, A Bill To Provide Relief for the Sponge-Fishing Industry by Making Special Nonquota Immigrant Visas Available to Certain Skilled Alien Spongedivers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. CRAMER. I yesterday introduced H. R. 12022, being a bill for providing relief for the sponge-fishing industry by making special nonquota immigrant visas available to certain skilled alien spongedivers.

At Tarpon Springs on the west coast of Florida is located the only sponge-fishing community and industry in the United States. This community was established in 1905 when the Greeks brought to Tarpon Springs the first sponge boat equipped for sponge diving with a completely Greek crew. Prior to that date sponge fishing was entirely dependent upon "sponge hooking" or fishing from the surface with various size poles to bring the sponges from the bottom. Currently, sponge fishing is conducted in the beds off the Florida coast in maximum depths up to 26 and 27 fathoms. The industry continued to prosper until during the Second World War. Tarpon Springs provided 65 per-

cent of the sponges, valued in millions of dollars used by our military forces and allies. The sponge-fishing community near the end of the war numbered hundreds of active Greek-American sponge fishermen, and at least 200 vessels were manned and active. For one-half century the sponge industry constituted and kept open the economic life of the large Greek-American community of Tarpon Springs, Fla. As a community it is one of the outstanding Greek centers of the United States with a record of self-sustenance and great pride in all civic matters.

Approximately 8 years ago a mysterious disease struck at and ruined the entire sponge-fishing grounds on the gulf coast, limiting the source of supply of what was generally stated to be the world's finest sponges. Many of the young descendants of those Greek fishing founders and those capable of working in the industry left for opportunities in the north. Frankly, there was much suffering in the community because of the loss of its one great source of income. I am proud to point out, however, that this Greek community has taken care of its own, and has fought through the years to provide a living for its people.

The sponge fields today have been by nature ridded of the blight and restored to their full productive ability. During the past year we have been successful in efforts with the Department of Interior, Bureau of Wildlife and Fisheries, Florida State University, University of Miami, Small Business Administration, Department of Commerce, and other Government agencies in organizing through the Sponge Industrial Committee of Tarpon Springs, Florida, a research of the potential of the industry and its rightful participation in the commercial market of the country. This has been a point of great effort on the part of the many individuals, organizations, and agencies.

In the further redevelopment of the industry an impasse has been reached through lack of experienced and capable spongedivers, skilled in the art of gathering this most useful and vital product of the sea. In Tarpon Springs there are ready and outfitted sponge-fishing boats only awaiting skilled divers to put out for the sponge beds. Through the Florida State Employment Service determination has been made that nowhere in the United States are these skilled craftsmen available. Sponge diving is an extremely skilled industry, one in which the Greeks have excelled for generations.

I have just introduced a bill, H. R. 12022, which would permit the entry into the United States of 50 skilled spongedivers for the relief of this industry, and to be employed therein; the same to be granted entrance to this country under this special bill not to be charged against the quota of the country from which they will come. It is anticipated these divers will come as Greek nationals for it is well known that the best sponge fishermen in the world are from the Dodecanese Islands of Greece, and particularly from the islands of Kalymnos, Halki, and Symi, where, from ancient times, sponge

fishing has been the principal means of livelihood of these people. It is appropriate that such immigration should be permitted from these particular areas, because 90 percent of the original Greek population of Tarpon Springs originated from these same islands and these emigrants would find themselves among their friends and relatives. I would quote from a letter addressed to me by Archbishop Michael of the Greek Orthodox Church in North and South America in which he urged such action in the economic relief of Tarpon Springs, saying:

Granting permission to this type of highly specialized labor will certainly be a credit to the industry and will not be a burden to the community, but rather will safeguard an industry that has contributed much economically to Tarpon Springs, to the State, and to our country as a whole.

Under the present immigration quotas and preferences established, this favorable action upon my bill is the only means available to save the economic life of one of America's most unique and proud communities.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives it is my intent to vigorously bring this matter to the attention of the committee seeking favorable report to the House of Representatives during this session of Congress, or otherwise to seek passage of this needed legislation.

Ignace Jan Paderewski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 29, 1956

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, June 29, 1956, marks the 15th anniversary of the death of Ignace Jan Paderewski.

The world of culture knows him as a renowned composer and pianist. Freedom-loving people everywhere remember him as the first Premier of the Polish Republic. It was in 1919 that he was elevated to that post by the people of Poland, after they asserted their independence in accordance with the principles of national self-determination as contained in the famous Fourteen Points of President Woodrow Wilson.

Paderewski was born in 1860 in a Polish province which was then under the domination of Russia. Much of his love of freedom was instilled in him by his father, who was imprisoned in Siberia.

Having attained world success in terms of both fame and money, he could easily have turned to an easy way of life. Instead, he returned to his homeland and his people where he devoted himself to furthering the true concepts of democratic freedom.

We hope some day to see the spirit of Paderewski revived not only in enslaved Poland but in every part of the world where liberty is presently suppressed.